arXiv:1409.3016v1 [math-ph] 10 Sep 2014

Operators on Partial Inner Product Spaces: Towards a Spectral Analysis

Jean-Pierre Antoine and Camillo Trapani

Abstract. Given a LHS (Lattice of Hilbert spaces) V_J and a symmetric operator A in V_J, in the sense of partial inner product spaces, we define a generalized resolvent for A and study the corresponding spectral properties. In particular, we examine, with help of the KLMN theorem, the question of generalized eigenvalues associated to points of the continuous (Hilbertian) spectrum. We give some examples, including so-called frame multipliers.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000). 46Cxx, 47A10, 47B37.

Keywords. Partial inner product spaces, lattices of Hilbert spaces, spectral properties of symmetric operators, resolvent, frame multipliers.

1. Introduction

In physics, rigged Hilbert spaces (RHS) are standard tools in Quantum Mechanics, in particular for reconciling the convenient bra-ket formalism of Dirac with the mathematically rigorous approach of von Neumann [5, Chap.7]. In particular, the question of generalized eigenvalues of observables, associated to points of the continuous spectrum, is solved with help of the celebrated Maurin-Gel'fand theorem.

In a recent paper, Bellomonte et al. [12] have attacked this problem by considering observables as operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^\times)$, for a suitable RHS $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{D}^\times$, where $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^\times)$ is the space of all continuous linear maps from $\mathcal{D}$ into $\mathcal{D}^\times$. However, the framework they use in a large part of their paper is in fact a partial inner product space (PIP-space), more precisely a LHS (Lattice of Hilbert spaces).

Indeed, the basic ingredient in [12] is that of a family $\mathfrak{F}$ of interspaces between $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}^\times$ [5, Sec. 5.4.1]. By interspace, one means a locally convex space $\mathcal{E}[\tau(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}^\times)]$, equipped with the Mackey topology from its conjugate dual, and such that $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{D}^\times$, where both embeddings are continuous and have dense range. In addition, one requires that the family $\mathfrak{F}$ of interspaces be a multiplication framework, that is, (i) $\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{F}$; (ii) for every $\mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{F}$, the conjugate dual $\mathcal{E}^\times$ also belongs to $\mathfrak{F}$; and (iii) for every pair $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F} \in \mathfrak{F}$, $\mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F} \in \mathfrak{F}$. Then, if every interspace $\mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{F}$ (except $\mathcal{D}$ and $D^\times$) is a Hilbert space, as assumed in most of [12], the resulting structure is a LHS (Lattice of Hilbert spaces) V_J in the sense of [5] and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^\times) \equiv \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$.

In view of this fact, we feel the analysis becomes simpler if one uses the language of PIP-spaces from the beginning. Thus we will make a few steps towards a spectral theory of symmetric operators in a LHS, following in part [12]. Our framework will be a LHS V_J and we adopt the definitions and notations of our monograph [5]. For the convenience of the reader, we summarize in the Appendix the salient features of PIP-spaces and operators on them.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the notion of inverse operator in the PIP-space context, with application to resolvents and, in particular, their analyticity properties. In Section 3, we discuss the various aspects of spectral analysis of Hilbert space operators, including the generalized eigenvalues and eigenvectors, in the light of the well-known KLMN theorem. In particular we revisit the notion of *tight rigging*. Section 4, finally, is devoted to several examples of spectral analysis of rather singular operators. As for notations, the domain of a Hilbert space operator A is denoted $D(A)$ and its range by $\mathrm{Ran}(A)$.



FIGURE 1. Action of the various operators. Each (assaying) space is represented by its index.

2. Inverses and resolvents

2.1. Invertible operators

The key ingredient of the spectral theory of operators is the notion of *resolvent*. For fixing ideas, given a closed operator A in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, consider $A - \lambda I : D(A) \to \mathcal{H}$. Then the resolvent of A is $R_\lambda(A) := (A - \lambda I)^{-1}$, for those $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ for which this inverse exists as an everywhere defined bounded operator in $\mathcal{H}$, that is, $\lambda \in \rho(A) \subset \mathbb{C}$, the resolvent set of A. In order to extend this notion to a PIP-space, we have first to define an appropriate concept of inverse of an operator, and this is nontrivial.

Let V_J be a LBS/LHS and $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$. According to [5, Sec. 3.3.2], we shall say that a representative A_{pq} is *invertible* if it is bijective, hence it has a continuous inverse $B_{qp} := (A_{pq})^{-1} : V_p \to V_q$. Any successor $A_{p'q'}, q' \leqslant q, p' \geqslant p$, of an invertible representative A_{pq} is injective and has dense range. An invertible representative has in general no predecessors, that is, a representative $A_{p'q'}$ with $q' \geqslant q, p' \leqslant p$,. This does not exclude the possibility for an invertible operator A to have a nontrivial null-space. Indeed, A may have a noninjective representative A_{sr}, where r is not comparable to q, i.e., there may exist a $g \in V_r$ such that $Ag = 0$, provided $g \notin V_q$. Note that, if A_{pq} is invertible, $A^\times_{\overline{q},\overline{p}}$ is also invertible and $(A^\times_{\overline{q},\overline{p}})^{-1} = (A^{-1}_{pq})' : V_{\overline{q}} \to V_{\overline{p}}$.

Given an operator $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, we recall that $(q,p) \in \mathsf{j}(A)$ means that A has a continuous representative $A_{pq} : V_q \to V_p$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let V_J be a LBS/LHS and $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) A has an invertible representative.

(ii) There exist an operator $B \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ and two indexes p, q such that $(p,q) \in \mathsf{j}(A)$, $(q,p) \in \mathsf{j}(B)$, and $AB = BA = I$.

Proof. (i) ⇒ (ii): Let A_{pq} be invertible. Since $(A_{pq})^{-1} : V_p \to V_q$ is continuous, it defines a unique operator $B \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, by $B_{qp} = (A_{pq})^{-1}$. Thus AB and BA are well defined, and $A_{pq}B_{qp} = I_{pp}, B_{qp}A_{pq} = I_{qq}$, that is, by the maximality property of PIP-space operators, $AB = BA = I$.

(ii) ⇒ (i): By the assumption, AB and BA are well defined. Since $AB = BA = I$, we may write $A_{pq}B_{qp} = I_{pp}$, $B_{qp}A_{pq} = I_{qq}$. Then, the first condition implies that A_{pq} is surjective and B_{qp} is injective, whereas the second condition implies that B_{qp} is surjective and A_{pq} is injective. Thus they are both bijective, hence boundedly invertible. □

We note that an algebraic condition, namely, AB, BA are well defined and $AB = BA = I$, is *not* sufficient. Therefore, on the basis of the previous lemma, we define invertibility of an PIP-space operator as follows.

Definition 2.2. Given a LBS/LHS, an operator $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ is *invertible* if it has at least one invertible representative.

Of course, the operator B defined by Lemma 2.1 (ii) will be called an *inverse* of A, but it remains to show that it is unique.

Proposition 2.3. *Let V_J be a LBS/LHS and $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ an invertible operator. Then A has a unique inverse $A^{-1} \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$.*

Proof. If A has the invertible representative A_{pq}, we know that it has an inverse B, such that $AB = BA = I$. Suppose now that A has two invertible representatives A_{pq} and A_{st}, that is, they are both bijective and continuous. In the same way as $(A_{pq})^{-1}$ defines a unique operator $B \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, $(A_{st})^{-1}$ defines a unique operator $C \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ by $C_{ts} = (A_{st})^{-1} : V_s \to V_t$. Thus we have $C_{ts}A_{st} = I_{tt}$ and $A_{st}C_{ts} = I_{ss}$. Hence we may write $AC = CA = I$, that is, C is also an inverse of A. We claim that $B = C$. First, B_{qp} and C_{ts} have well-defined restrictions to $V_{p\wedge s}$, namely, $B_{q,p\wedge s}$, resp. $C_{t,p\wedge s}$. Next, according to Lemma 3.3.29 of [5], $(q\wedge t, p\wedge s)$ belongs to $\mathrm{j}(A)$ and $A_{p\wedge s,q\wedge t}$ is also bijective and continuous. Hence $A_{p\wedge s,q\wedge t}$ has a continuous inverse $D_{q\wedge t,p\wedge s} = (A_{p\wedge s,q\wedge t})^{-1} : V_{p\wedge s} \to V_{q\wedge t}$. The latter defines a unique operator $D \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, that is another inverse of A. One has indeed:

$$\text{For } f \in V_p,\ (ABf)_p = A_{pq}\, B_{qp}\, f_p = f_p\,,$$
$$\text{For } g \in V_s,\ (ACg)_s = A_{st}\, C_{ts}\, g_s = g_s\,,$$
$$\text{For } h \in V_{p\wedge s},\ (ADh)_{p\wedge s} = A_{p\wedge s,q\wedge t}\, D_{q\wedge t,p\wedge s}\, h_{p\wedge s} = h_{p\wedge s}\,.$$

We refer to Fig. 1 for the action of the various operators A, B, C, D.

Clearly, $A_{p\wedge s,q\wedge t}$ is the restriction of A_{pq} to $V_{q\wedge t}$. In the same way, $D_{q\wedge t,p\wedge s}$ is the restriction of B_{qp} to $V_{p\wedge s}$. Similarly, $D_{q\wedge t,p\wedge s}$ is also the restriction of C_{ts} to $V_{p\wedge s}$. Thus B_{qp} and C_{ts} have the same restriction to $V_{p\wedge s}$, *a fortiori* to $V^{\#}$, which implies that $B = C \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$. (This supersedes Remark 3.3 of [12]). □

Remarks 2.4. (1) If B is an inverse of A, we have written $AB = BA = I$, but this requires some qualification. In the case of an unbounded invertible operator X in a Hilbert space, one has to write $X^{-1}\,X \subset I$, instead of $X^{-1}\,X = I$, because the l.h.s. has a dense domain, whereas the identity is everywhere defined. But in a PIP-space, the notion of extension of an operator does not exist, every operator is maximal, by definition (see Sec. A.2). The inverse condition $B_{qp}A_{pq} = (BA)_{qq} = I_{qq}$ means, first, that the product BA is well defined, then that it coincides with the identity on V_q. Since a single representative determines a unique operator in $\mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, it follows that $BA = I$ as PIP-space operators. The same reasoning applies if one restricts oneself to $V^{\#}$: if $BAf = f$, for every $f \in V^{\#}$, one has again $BA = I$. .

We emphasize that, in general, the product BA may have many more representatives (that is, it can be better behaved) than the operator A itself, because of the maximality axiom. This is precisely the case here.

(2) As a final remark, we may note that the crucial Lemma 3.3.29 of [5] is true for any projective, positive definite indexed PIP-space, that is, an indexed PIP-space, in which any intersection $V_{p\wedge q} = V_p \cap V_q$ carries the projective topology inherited from V_p and V_q. This is the case when both spaces are Fréchet spaces, in particular, for a LHS/LBS. Thus, whereas Lemma 2.1 holds in general, uniqueness of the inverse is valid only in the projective case, since the proof of Proposition 2.3 relies on the Lemma 3.3.29 of [5].

2.2. Regular points

In this section we will extend to PIP-spaces the notion of regular points familiar in Hilbert space theory (see [23, Chap.2] or [24, Chap.8]).

Definition 2.5. A number $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ is called a *J-regular* point for $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, if there exist $(q, p) \in \mathrm{j}(A)$, with $q \leqslant p$, and constants c_λ, d_λ such that

$$c_\lambda \left\|f\right\|_q \leqslant \left\|(A - \lambda I)f\right\|_p \leqslant d_\lambda \left\|f\right\|_q\,,\ \forall\, f \in V_q\,. \tag{2.1}$$

Note that the upper bound (which is absent in the Hilbert space context) results simply from the fact the the representative A_{pq} is bounded. The set of J-regular points of A will be denoted by $\pi^J(A)$. Clearly, $\lambda \in \pi^J(A)$ if and only if there exist $(q, p) \in \mathrm{j}(A)$, with $q \leqslant p$, such that $(A - \lambda I)_{pq}$ is injective. We also denote by $\pi^{(q,p)}(A)$ the set of J-regular points of A for fixed q, p.

Actually (2.1) implies that that the inverse of $(A-\lambda I)_{pq} : V_q \to V_p$ is bounded, but it is defined only on $\mathrm{Ran}(A-\lambda I)_{pq}$, which need not be the whole of V_p. For $\lambda \in \pi^{(q,p)}(A)$, call $d_\lambda^{(q,p)}(A) := \dim\,[\mathrm{Ran}(A-\lambda I)_{pq}]^\perp$, the orthogonal being taken in V_p, the *defect number* of A at λ with respect to p, q.

Let $(q, p) \in \mathrm{j}(A)$. Then the following relations are immediate:

- if $p \leqslant p'$, then $d_\lambda^{(q,p)}(A) \leqslant d_\lambda^{(q,p')}(A)$.
- if $p' \leqslant p$ and $\mathrm{Ran}(A - \lambda I)_{pq} \subset V_{p'}$, then $d_\lambda^{(q,p)}(A) \geqslant d_\lambda^{(q,p')}(A)$.
- if p and p' are not comparable, there is no *a priori* relation between the defect indices.

On the other hand,

- if $q' \leqslant q$, then $d_\lambda^{(q,p)}(A) \leqslant d_\lambda^{(q',p)}(A)$.
- if $q \leqslant q'$ and $\mathrm{Ran}(A-\lambda I)_{pq'} \subset V_p$, then $d_\lambda^{(q,p)}(A) \geqslant d_\lambda^{(q',p)}(A)$.
- if q and q' are not comparable, there is no *a priori* relation between the defect indices.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ and $(q,p) \in \mathrm{j}(A)$. Then:*

(i) *$\lambda \in \pi^{(q,p)}(A)$ if and only if $(A-\lambda I)_{pq}$ has a bounded inverse $[(A-\lambda I)_{pq}]^{-1}$ defined on $\mathrm{Ran}(A-\lambda I)_{pq} \subset V_p$.*

(ii) *$\mathrm{Ran}(A-\lambda I)_{pq} = \overline{\mathrm{Ran}[(A-\lambda I)\restriction V^\#]}^p$ for each $\lambda \in \pi^{(q,p)}(A)$, , where $\overline{\{\cdot\}}^p$ denotes the closure in V_p.*

(iii) *if $\lambda \in \pi^{(q,p)}(A)$, then $\mathrm{Ran}(A-\lambda I)_{pq}$ is closed in V_p.*

Proof. (i) follows from (2.1).

(ii) Let $g \in \overline{\mathrm{Ran}[(A-\lambda I)\restriction V^\#]}^p$. Thus there exists a sequence $\{f_n\}$ in $V^\#$ such that $g_n := (A-\lambda I)f_n \to g \in V_p$. By (2.1), we have

$$\|f_n - f_m\|_q \leqslant c_\lambda^{-1} \|(A-\lambda I)(f_n - f_m)\|_p = c_\lambda^{-1} \|g_n - g_m\|_p ,$$

which implies that $\{f_n\}$ is Cauchy in V_q, hence convergent in V_q. Let $f = \lim_n f_n$. Then $Af_n = g_n + \lambda f_n \to g + \lambda f \in V_p$. Since A_{pq} is continuous, this implies $Af = g + \lambda f$, thus $(A-\lambda I)f = g \in \mathrm{Ran}(A-\lambda I)_{pq}$. Hence $\overline{\mathrm{Ran}[(A-\lambda I)\restriction V^\#]}^p \subseteq \mathrm{Ran}(A-\lambda I)_{pq}$. The converse inclusion follows from the completeness of V_q.

(iii) follows from (ii). □

The following result follows closely [12, Props. 3.13 and 3.14].

Proposition 2.7. *(i) The set $\pi^J(A)$ of J-regular points of A is an open subset of $\mathbb{C}$.*
(ii) Let $(q,p) \in \mathrm{j}(A)$. Then the defect number $d_\lambda^{(q,p)}(A)$ is constant on each connected component of the open set $\pi^{(q,p)}(A)$.

Proof. (i) Let $\lambda_0 \in \pi^J(A)$. hence there exist $(q,p) \in \mathrm{j}(A)$, with $q \leqslant p$ such that $\lambda_0 \in \pi^{(q,p)}(A)$. Assume that $|\lambda - \lambda_0| < c_{\lambda_0}$, where c_{λ_0} is the constant appearing in (2.1). Then one shows easily that λ satisfies (2.1), that is, $\lambda \in \pi^{(q,p)}(A)$. This in turn implies $\lambda \in \pi^J(A)$.

As for (ii), this follows from a standard argument. □

2.3. Resolvents

Now we turn to resolvents, following the pattern traditional for Hilbert spaces. Given $(q,p) \in \mathrm{j}(A)$, with $q \leqslant p$, define

$$\rho^{(q,p)}(A) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : (A-\lambda I)_{pq} \text{ is bijective}\}.$$

Since $(A-\lambda I)_{pq}$ is bijective, it has a continuous inverse $[(A-\lambda I)_{pq}]^{-1} : V_p \to V_q \in \mathcal{B}(V_p, V_q)$, where, as usual, $\mathcal{B}(V_p, V_q)$ denotes the set of bounded linear operators from V_p to V_q. Of course, every $\lambda \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A)$ is a J-regular point of A.

Definition 2.8. Let $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$. Then the *J-resolvent set* of A, noted $\rho^J(A)$, is the set of complex numbers λ for which there exists $(q,p) \in \mathrm{j}(A)$, with $q \leqslant p$, such that $(A-\lambda I)_{pq}$ is bijective. Thus we have:

$$\rho^J(A) = \bigcup_{(q,p)\in \mathrm{j}(A)} \rho^{(q,p)}(A) = \overline{\rho^J(A^\times)}, \tag{2.2}$$

where the overbar denotes complex conjugation. The *J-spectrum* of A is $\sigma^J(A) := \mathbb{C} \setminus \rho^J(A)$.

For future use, we recall the known facts (see [12] for a proof) that the set of invertible elements is open in $\mathcal{B}(V_p, V_q)$ and that the map $A \mapsto A^{-1}$ is continuous in $\mathcal{B}(V_p, V_q)$.

For $\lambda \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A)$, the operator $(A-\lambda I)_{pq} : V_q \to V_p$ is bijective and continuous, hence invertible with the bounded inverse $[(A-\lambda I)_{pq}]^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(V_p, V_q)$. Therefore, as discussed in Section 2.1, the operator $(A-\lambda I) \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ is invertible, in the sense of Definition 2.2, with inverse $R_\lambda(A) := (A-\lambda I)^{-1} \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, called the *$J$-resolvent* of A, and defined by the representative

$$R_\lambda(A)_{qp} = [(A-\lambda I)^{-1}]_{qp} = [(A-\lambda I)_{pq}]^{-1} : V_p \to V_q .$$

Clearly, we have

$$\mathrm{j}(R_\lambda(A)) = \{(p,q) \text{ such that } (q,p) \in \mathrm{j}(A) \text{ and } \lambda \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A)\}.$$

Using these notions, one may prove the standard results on analytical properties found in spectral theory, for instance in [23, Sec.2.2]. In a first step we fix a suitable pair (q,p).

Proposition 2.9. *Let $(q,p) \in \mathsf{j}(A) \cap \mathsf{j}(B)$, with $q \leqslant p$. Then*

(i) $R_\lambda(A)_{qp} - R_\lambda(B)_{qp} = R_\lambda(A)_{qp}\,(B-A)_{pq}\,R_\lambda(B)_{qp},\ \forall\,\lambda \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A) \cap \rho^{(q,p)}(B)$.
(ii) $R_\lambda(A)_{qp} - R_\mu(A)_{qp} = (\lambda-\mu) R_\lambda(A)_{qp}\,R_\mu(A)_{qp},\ \forall\,\lambda,\mu \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A)$.
(iii) $\rho^{(q,p)}(A)$ *is open.*
(iv) *The function $\lambda \mapsto R_\lambda(A)_{qp} \in \mathcal{B}(V_p,V_q)$ is analytic on every connected component of $\rho^{(q,p)}(A)$.*

For details and proofs, see [12, Lemma 3.20 and Theor. 3.21].

For fixed q, if $\lambda \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A)$ for some $p \geqslant q$, this p is unique. Thus we may as well write

$$f^{(q)}(\lambda) := R_\lambda(A)_{qp} = [(A-\lambda I)^{-1}]_{qp} \in \mathcal{B}(V_p,V_q) \tag{2.3}$$

Hence, according to Proposition 2.9 (iv), the function $f^{(q)}$ is a single valued function, analytic in the operator norm of $\mathcal{B}(V_p,V_q)$ on every connected component of the open set $\rho^{(q,p)}(A)$.

The next step is to obtain the resolvent series. To that effect, we have to define powers of operators between different spaces (such as the resolvents). Given $A,B \in \mathcal{B}(V_p,V_q)$, $q \leqslant p$, define $A_0 := A\restriction V_q$. Then successive powers may be defined as follows:

- $ABf = A_0(Bf),\ \forall\, f \in V_p$, so that $AB : V_p \to V_q$ and $\|AB\|_{p,q} \leqslant \|A_0\|_{q,q}\,\|B\|_{p,q}$;
- $A^{(2)} := A_0 A$ and $A^{(n)} := A_0 A^{(n-1)}$.

Then, as in [12, Prop. 3.23], we get

Proposition 2.10. *Let $(q,p) \in \mathsf{j}(A)$, with $q \leqslant p$, and $\lambda_0 \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A)$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda-\lambda_0| < \delta$, $\lambda \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A)$ and*

$$R_\lambda(A)_{qp} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\lambda-\lambda_0)^n [R_{\lambda_0}(A)_{qp}]^{(n+1)},$$

where the series converges in the operator norm of $\mathcal{B}(V_p,V_q)$.

Using the notations of PIP-spaces, we may rewrite Proposition 2.9 in an intrinsic way.

Theorem 2.11. *Let $A,B \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$. Then the following statements hold true.*

(i) *Suppose there is a couple $(q,p) \in \mathsf{j}(A) \cap \mathsf{j}(B)$, with $q \leqslant p$, such that $\rho^{(q,p)}(A) \cap \rho^{(q,p)}(B) \neq \emptyset$. Then*

$$R_\lambda(A) - R_\lambda(B) = R_\lambda(A)\,(B-A)\,R_\lambda(B),\ \forall\,\lambda \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A) \cap \rho^{(q,p)}(B).$$

(ii) $R_\lambda(A) - R_\mu(A) = (\lambda-\mu)\,R_\lambda(A)\,R_\mu(A),\ \forall\,\lambda,\mu \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A)$.
(iii) $\rho^J(A)$ *is open.*
(iv) *The function $\lambda \mapsto R_\lambda(A) \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ is analytic on every connected component of the open set $\rho^J(A)$, for the inductive topology τ_{ind} defined by the spaces $\mathcal{B}(V_p,V_q)$.*

Proof. (i) The (q,p)-representative of the statement is exactly relation (i) of Proposition 2.9.
(ii) Same argument with relation (ii) of Proposition 2.9.
(iii)-(iv) The statements follow from the corresponding ones of Proposition 2.9 and (2.2). □

Remark 2.12. Although these results are not more general at first sight than the usual, Hilbert space, ones, Theorem 2.11 shows, once again, how the PIP-space language allows to treat very singular operators as if they were bounded. Examples will be given in Section 4.

As a consequence of (iv), the resolvent function is clearly analytic with respect to the weak topology of $\mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ defined by the seminorms $X \mapsto |\langle Xf|g\rangle|,\ f,g \in V^\#$. To be precise, we introduce a formal definition.

Definition 2.13. The function $B : z \mapsto B(z) \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ is said to be *weakly analytic* at $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ if there exists an operator $B'(z_0) \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ such that

$$\lim_{z\to z_0} \left\langle \left(\frac{B(z)-B(z_0)}{z-z_0} - B'(z_0) \right) f \,\middle|\, g \right\rangle = 0,\ \forall\, f,g \in V^\#.$$

But there is more. Under a mild condition of continuity, weak analyticity implies analyticity with respect to the norm of the space $\mathcal{B}(V_p, V_q)$ for some couple $(q,p) \in \mathfrak{j}(A)$. The following proposition applies, in particular, to the resolvent function $\lambda \mapsto R_\lambda(A) \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$.

Proposition 2.14. *Let $B : z \mapsto B(z) \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ be weakly analytic in an open set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{C}$. Assume there is a couple $(q,p) \in J \times J$ and an open neighbourhood $U(z_0) \subset \mathcal{A}$ such that $(p,q) \in \mathfrak{j}(B(z))$, $\forall\, z \in U(z_0)$. If the function $z \mapsto B(z)f$ is continuous from $\mathcal{A}$ into V_p for every fixed $f \in V^\#$, then the function $z \mapsto B(z)_{qp}$ is analytic on $U(z_0)$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{p,q}$.*

First we need a lemma.

Lemma 2.15. *Let the circle $\mathcal{C} := \{z : |z - z_0| = r\}$ be contained in $U(z_0)$. Then, under the assumptions of Proposition 2.14, one has*

$$\gamma := \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \|B(z)_{qp}\|_{p,q} < \infty. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is compact, the continuity of the function $z \mapsto B(z)f$ from $\mathcal{A}$ into V_p implies there exists a constant $\gamma_{fg} > 0$ such that, for all $z \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$|\langle B(z)f|g\rangle| \leqslant \gamma_{fg},\ \forall\, f \in V^\#,\ g \in V_{\overline{p}}.$$

Then, by the uniform boundedness theorem, $\sup_{z\in\mathcal{C}} \|B(z)f\|_p < \infty$. This in turn implies the relation (2.4). □

Proof of Proposition 2.14. We investigate the analyticity of the function $U(z_0) \ni z \to B(z)_{qp}$. Putting $\mathcal{C} \subset U(z_0)$ and $z = z_0 + h$, we have, by the Cauchy integral formula,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle \frac{B(z_0+h) - B(z_0)}{h} f \middle| g \right\rangle - \langle B'(z_0)f|g\rangle = \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{h}\Big(\frac{1}{z-(z_0+h)} - \frac{1}{z-z_0}\Big)\langle B(z)f|g\rangle\, \mathrm{d}z - \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{(z-z_0)^2}\langle B(z)f|g\rangle\, \mathrm{d}z \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\frac{1}{h}\Big(\frac{1}{z-(z_0+h)} - \frac{1}{z-z_0}\Big) - \frac{1}{(z-z_0)^2}\right)\langle B(z)f|g\rangle\, \mathrm{d}z.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left\langle \frac{B(z_0+h) - B(z_0)}{h} f \middle| g \right\rangle - \langle B'(z_0)f|g\rangle\right| \leqslant \\
&\qquad \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \left|\left(\frac{1}{h}\Big(\frac{1}{z-(z_0+h)} - \frac{1}{z-z_0}\Big) - \frac{1}{(z-z_0)^2}\right)\right| \|B(z)_{qp}\|_{q,p}\, \|f\|_p\, \|g\|_{\overline{q}}\, \mathrm{d}z.
\end{aligned}$$

In virtue of (2.4), this implies

$$\left|\left\langle \frac{B(z_0+h) - B(z_0)}{h} f \middle| g \right\rangle - \langle B'(z_0)f|g\rangle\right| \leqslant \gamma\, \|f\|_q\, \|g\|_{\overline{p}}.$$

Since

$$\frac{B(z_0+h) - B(z_0)}{h} f = \frac{B_{qp}(z_0+h) - B_{qp}(z_0)}{h} f \in V_q,$$

it follows that $|\langle B'(z_0)f|g\rangle| \leqslant \gamma'\, \|f\|_p\, \|g\|_{\overline{q}}$. This implies that $(p,q) \in \mathfrak{j}(B'(z_0))$.

From this it follows also that the equality (2.5) extends to all $f \in V_p$ and $g \in V_{\overline{q}}$. Thus $z \mapsto B(z)$ is analytic as a map from $U(z_0)$ into $B(V_p, V_q)$. Hence it is analytic with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{p,q}$ and $B'(z_0)$ belongs to the same space. □

If $\lambda_0 \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A)$ the function $f^{(q)}(\lambda)$ defined in (2.3) is analytic on a disk $D_r = \{\lambda : |\lambda - \lambda_0| < r\} \subset \rho^{(q,p)}(A)$ around λ_0. In the same way, if $\lambda_0 \in \rho^{(t,s)}(A)$ the function $f^{(t)}(\lambda)$ is analytic on another disk $D_{r'} \subset \rho^{(t,s)}(A)$ around λ_0. As discussed in the proof of Proposition 2.3, we know that $(q \wedge t, p \wedge s)$ belongs to $\mathfrak{j}(A)$ and $A_{p\wedge s, q\wedge t}$ is the restriction of A_{pq} to $V_{q\wedge t}$. In the same way, $R_\lambda^{(q\wedge t, p\wedge s)}(A)$ is the restriction of $R_\lambda^{(q,p)}(A)$ to $V_{p\wedge s}$. Hence, the function $f^{(q\wedge t)}(\lambda)$ is the restriction of the function $f^{(q)}(\lambda)$, and also of $f^{(t)}(\lambda)$. In other words, these functions are analytic continuations of each other and there is only one

resolvent $R_\lambda(A) = (A-\lambda I)^{-1} \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ with representatives $R_\lambda^{(q,p)}(A)$, each of them analytic on the corresponding open set $\rho^{(q,p)}(A)$.

Next, varying p or q gives rise to (generalized) eigenvalues, which are defined in the obvious way.

Definition 2.16. Given $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, we say that λ is a *(generalized) eigenvalue* of A if there is a pair $(q,p) \in \mathrm{j}(A)$ such that $A_{pq} - \lambda E_{pq} = (A-\lambda I)_{pq}$ is not injective. Every nonzero vector $f \in \mathrm{Ker}(A-\lambda I)_{pq}$ is called a *(generalized) eigenvector*. If this is true for every $q \in J$, equivalently, for $V_q = V^\#$, we say that λ is a (global) eigenvalue of A.

Then one has:

Lemma 2.17. *Let $(q,p) \in \mathrm{j}(A), \lambda \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A)$, with $q \leqslant p$. Then*

(i) *$\lambda \in \sigma^{(q,p')}(A), \forall\, p' \gneqq p$, where $\sigma^{(q,p')}(A) := \mathbb{C} \setminus \rho^{(q,p')}(A)$ may be called the relative spectrum of A.*
(ii) *if $q \lneqq q' \leqslant p$ and $(q',p) \in \mathrm{j}(A)$, then λ is an eigenvalue of $A_{pq'}$ and hence $\lambda \in \sigma^{(q',p)}(A)$.*

Proof. Since $\lambda \in \rho^{(q,p)}(A)$, the operator $(A-\lambda I)_{pq}$ is bijective from V_q onto V_p. Thus it cannot be bijective onto $V_{p'}$, which means that $\lambda \notin \rho^{(q,p')}(A)$, i.e., $\lambda \in \sigma^{(q,p')}(A)$.

(ii) Again $(A-\lambda I)_{pq}$ is bijective from V_q onto V_p. Take $f' \in V_{q'} \setminus V_q$. Since $(A-\lambda I)_{pq}$ is surjective, there exists a unique vector $f \in V_q$ such that $(A-\lambda I)f' = (A-\lambda I)f$, hence $g = f' - f \in V_{q'}$ is nonzero and satisfies $(A-\lambda I)g = 0$, thus λ is an eigenvalue of $A_{pq'}$ and hence $\lambda \in \sigma^{(q',p)}(A)$. □

2.4. RHS generated by symmetric operators: A counterexample

Given a self-adjoint operator A in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, the scale built on the powers of A is constructed in the standard way. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\mathcal{H}_n = D(A^n)$ with the graph norm $\|\cdot\|_n = \|(I+A^{2n})^{1/2}\|$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{n}} := \mathcal{H}_{-n}$ as the completion of $\mathcal{H}$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\overline{n}} = \|(I+A^{2n})^{-1/2}\|$. Then $V_J = \{\mathcal{H}_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the familiar scale [5, Sec.5.2.1]:

$$D^\infty(A) := \bigcap_n \mathcal{H}_n \subset \ldots \subset \mathcal{H}_2 \subset \mathcal{H}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{1}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{2}} \ldots \subset \bigcup_n \mathcal{H}_n. \tag{2.6}$$

In this scale, A maps $\mathcal{H}_n$ into $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$ continuously, for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Denote by $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$ the usual resolvent of A. Let $S \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ denote the operator defined by $A\restriction D^\infty(A)$. Then it is shown in [12, Prop. 4.1] that $\rho^J(S) = \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$. This result, however, fails in a more complicated case.

Let indeed S be a closed symmetric operator with several self-adjoint extensions $S_\alpha, \alpha \in I$. For any self-adjoint extension S_α of S, $D(S^n) \subset D(S_\alpha^n)$ and $D(S^\infty) \subset D(S_\alpha^\infty)$.

Put $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n} = D(S_\alpha^n)$, with the graph norm, and $V_{J_0} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}, \alpha \in I, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then $S : \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n} \to \mathcal{H}_{\beta,m}$ continuously if and only if $\alpha = \beta$ and $m \leqslant n-1$. Next, for each $\alpha \in I$, $\rho^{(\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n-1})} = \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(S_\alpha)$ and $\rho^{J_0}(S) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(S_\alpha)$.

A standard example, given in [12], is that of the first order differential operator $S := -i\,\mathrm{d}/\mathrm{d}x$ on a segment of the real line. We sketch it here. Define the operator S on the domain

$$D(S) = \{f \in L^2(0,1) : f' \in L^2(0,1), f(0) = f(1) = 0\}.$$

Its adjoint is $S^* := -i\,\mathrm{d}/\mathrm{d}x$ on the domain $D(S^*) = \{f \in L^2(0,1) : f' \in L^2(0,1)\}$. Next define the operator $S_\alpha = -i\,\mathrm{d}/\mathrm{d}x$ on the domain

$$D(S_\alpha) = \{f \in L^2(0,1) : f' \in L^2(0,1), f(1) = \alpha f(0), \alpha \in \mathbb{C}, |\alpha| = 1\}.$$

Clearly one has $S \subset S_\alpha \subset S^*$, S is closed and symmetric, each S_α is self-adjoint, thus a self-adjoint extension of S, but S_α, S_β are not comparable for $\alpha \neq \beta$. Then it is shown in [12] that the resolvents $(S_\alpha - \lambda I)^{-1}$ and $(S_\beta - \lambda I)^{-1}$ are *not* analytic continuation of each other if $\alpha \neq \beta$.

Actually, this result does not contradict that of Section 2.3, because V_{J_0} is *not* a LHS, indeed J_0 is not a lattice, since $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n} \cap \mathcal{H}_{\beta,m} \notin V_{J_0}$! And the lattice property is the key to the uniqueness of inverse operators, as we have seen in Section 2.1. In fact, V_{J_0} is a collection of scales of Hilbert spaces, $V_{S_\alpha}, \alpha \in I$, mutually incompatible. To get a genuine LHS, one has to consider the lattice J generated by J_0, but this is not very natural .... For instance,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n} \cap \mathcal{H}_{\beta,m} = D(S_\alpha^n) \cap D(S_\beta^m) \supset D(S^n) \cap D(S^m) = D(S^{\max(n,m)}).$$

Thus it is not surprising that differential operators on an interval yield pathologies (multivalued analytic functions).

3. Spectral analysis of Hilbert space operators

In this section, we shall discuss the spectral analysis of self-adjoint operators in Hilbert spaces, in the light of PIP-spaces. We consider again the simplest case, namely, a Hilbert scale.

3.1. Generalized eigenvalues and generalized eigenvectors

Let $A > I$ be a self-adjoint operator in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and $V_J = \{\mathcal{H}_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ the usual scale on powers of A, thus $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}$. Given $X \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(m, -m) \in \mathrm{j}(X)$, with $\mathcal{H}_m \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$, where $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}} := \mathcal{H}_{-m}$. Define

$$D(X_{0,m}) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_m : Xf \in \mathcal{H}\}$$
$$X_{0,m} f = Xf,\ f \in D(X_{0,m}). \tag{3.1}$$

Then $X_{0,m}$ is a restriction of X, with $D(X_{0,m}) \subset \mathcal{H}_m$, but its domain need not be dense in $\mathcal{H}$, it could even be reduced to $\{0\}$.

In order to go further, we have to resort to a version of the KLMN Theorem [5, Theorems 3.3.25 and 3.3.27].

Proposition 3.1. *Let $X = X^\times \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ be a symmetric operator. Assume that $(m, n) \in \mathrm{j}(X)$, with $\mathcal{H}_m \subseteq \mathcal{H}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_n$, and there is a λ such that $(X - \lambda I)_{nm}$ is a bijection, hence it is boundedly invertible. Then there exists a unique restriction of X_{nm} to a self-adjoint operator X_0 in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_0$. The number λ does not belong to the (Hilbertian) spectrum of X_0. The domain of X_0 is obtained by eliminating from $\mathcal{H}_m$ exactly the vectors f that are mapped by X_{nm} beyond $\mathcal{H}_0$.*

Proof. Define $D(X_0) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_m : Xf \in \mathcal{H}_0\}$ and $X_0 := X_{nm}{\restriction}D(X_0)$ Define

$$R_{mn} := (X_{nm} - \lambda E_{nm})^{-1} : \mathcal{H}_n \to \mathcal{H}_m$$

as the inverse of the invertible representative $(X - \lambda I)_{nm}$. Then $R_{00} = E_{0m} R_{mn} E_{n0}$ is a restriction of R_{mn}. By [5, Lemma 3.3.26], R_{00} has a self-adjoint inverse $(R_{00})^{-1} = (X_0 - \lambda I)$, which is a restriction of $X_{nm} - \lambda E_{nm}$. Thus X_{nm} has a self-adjoint, densely defined, restriction to $\mathcal{H}_0$. Since R_{mn} is bounded, so is $R_{00} = (X_0 - \lambda I)^{-1}$, thus λ does not belong to the spectrum of X_0. □

This result applies, in particular, to the case $(m, \overline{m}) \in \mathrm{j}(X)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, described at the beginning of the section, since $m \leqslant 0 \leqslant \overline{m}$. Then X has an invertible representative $X_{\overline{m}m}$.

Actually one can go further, in the case of an arbitrary LHS, using the generalized KLMN Theorem [5, Theorem 3.3.28]. Thus we consider a symmetric operator $X = X^\times \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ in an arbitrary LHS $V_J = \{\mathcal{H}_n, n \in J\}$ and we assume there exists a $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $X - \lambda I$ has an invertible representative $X_{nm} - \lambda E_{nm} : \mathcal{H}_m \to \mathcal{H}_n$, where $\mathcal{H}_m \subseteq \mathcal{H}_n$, but neither of these need be comparable to $\mathcal{H}_0$. Before stating a proposition and sketching its proof, it is worth clarifying the position of the various spaces involved.

On one hand, the key step in the proof of [5, Theorem 3.3.28] is the relation

$$\mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_{m\vee\overline{m}}. \tag{3.2}$$

On the other hand, since X is symmetric and $(X - \lambda I)_{nm} : \mathcal{H}_m \to \mathcal{H}_n$ is one-to-one and continuous, so is $(X - \lambda I)_{\overline{m},\overline{n}} : \mathcal{H}_{\overline{n}} \to \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$, and therefore, by Lemma 3.3.29 of [5], also $(X - \lambda I)_{\overline{m}\wedge n, m\wedge\overline{n}} : \mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{n}} \to \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}\wedge n}$ and $(X - \lambda I)_{\overline{m}\vee n, m\vee\overline{n}} : \mathcal{H}_{m\vee\overline{n}} \to \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}\vee n}$. However, since $m \leqslant n$, we have also $\overline{n} \leqslant \overline{m}$ and $m \wedge \overline{n} \leqslant \overline{m} \wedge n$ and $m \vee \overline{m} \leqslant \overline{m} \vee n$. Therefore, by [5, Prop.2.5.1], we can complete (3.2):

$$\mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{n}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_{m\vee\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}\vee n}. \tag{3.3}$$

However, neither $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}\wedge n}$, nor $\mathcal{H}_{m\vee\overline{n}}$ need be comparable to $\mathcal{H}_0$. Thus we take a predecessor, resp. a successor, and consider the map $(X - \lambda I)_{\overline{m}\vee n, m\wedge\overline{n}} : \mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{n}} \to \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}\vee n}$.

Now, in addition to (3.3), we have two more chains, which do not contain $\mathcal{H}_0$:

$$\mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{n}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{n\wedge\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{m\vee\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}\vee n}\,, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{n}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{H}_m \subset \mathcal{H}_{m\vee\overline{n}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{m\vee\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}\vee n}\,. \tag{3.5}$$

This is useful when V_J is a chain, since then $m \wedge \overline{n} = \min(m, \overline{n}), \overline{m} \vee n = \max(\overline{m} \vee n)$, and so on. In that situation, we have exactly four cases:

(i) If $m \leqslant \overline{n}$, (3.4) yields one of the following
  (ia) $m \leqslant n \leqslant 0 \leqslant \overline{n} \leqslant \overline{m}$ and $X - \lambda I : \mathcal{H}_m \to \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$, if $n \leqslant \overline{n}$,
  (ib) $m \leqslant \overline{n} \leqslant 0 \leqslant n \leqslant \overline{m}$ and $X - \lambda I : \mathcal{H}_m \to \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$, if $n \geqslant \overline{n}$.

(ii) If $m \geqslant \overline{n}$, (3.5) yields yields one of the following
(iia) $\overline{n} \leqslant m \leqslant 0 \leqslant \overline{m} \leqslant n$ and $X - \lambda I : \mathcal{H}_{\overline{n}} \to \mathcal{H}_n$, if $m \leqslant \overline{m}$,
(iib) $\overline{n} \leqslant \overline{m} \leqslant 0 \leqslant m \leqslant n$ and $X - \lambda I : \mathcal{H}_{\overline{n}} \to \mathcal{H}_n$, if $m \geqslant \overline{m}$.

Of course, if $m = \overline{n}$, both (ib) and (iia) yield simply $m \leqslant 0 \leqslant \overline{m}$. In all cases, the triplet (3.2) reduces either to $\mathcal{H}_m \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$ or to $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_m$.

Now we can state a proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $X = X^\times \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ be a symmetric operator in an arbitrary LHS $V_J = \{\mathcal{H}_n, n \in J\}$. Assume there exists a $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $X - \lambda I$ has an invertible representative $X_{nm} - \lambda E_{nm} : \mathcal{H}_m \to \mathcal{H}_n$, where $\mathcal{H}_m \subseteq \mathcal{H}_n$. Then X_{nm} determines a unique, densely defined, self-adjoint operator X_0 in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0$. The number λ does not belong to the spectrum of X_0.*

Idea of the proof [5, Theorem 3.3.28] : Let again

$$R_{mn} := (X_{nm} - \lambda E_{nm})^{-1} : \mathcal{H}_n \to \mathcal{H}_m.$$

This defines a symmetric operator $R = R^\times \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$. The key fact in the proof is the relation (3.2). Then the three representatives $R_{m\wedge\overline{m},m\wedge\overline{m}}, R_{00}, R_{m\vee\overline{m},m\vee\overline{m}}$ exist, are injective and have dense range. Next R_{00} is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_0$. Since it is injective and has dense range, its inverse $(R_{00})^{-1} = X_0 - \lambda I$ is also self-adjoint and densely defined. The rest is as in Proposition 3.1. □

Note that the domain of X_0 is $D(X_0) = R_{00}\mathcal{H}_0$, but we can't say more at this level of generality. As indicated above, we can consider the map $(X - \lambda I)_{\overline{m}\vee n,m\wedge\overline{n}} : \mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{n}} \to \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}\vee n}$ and its restriction to the domain $D_0 := \{f \in \mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{n}} : Xf \in \mathcal{H}_0\}$. However we don't know if this domain is dense in $\mathcal{H}_0$.

In the case of a chain, things get simpler.

Corollary 3.3. *Let the LHS $V_J = \{\mathcal{H}_n, n \in J\}$ of Proposition 3.2 be a chain of Hilbert spaces. Then, the domain of the self-adjoint operator X_0 may be described explicitly and is obtained by restriction, as in Proposition 3.1.*

Proof. In the four cases above, the dual pair $\mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{n}}, \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}\vee n}$ reduces to $\mathcal{H}_m, \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$ or $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{n}}, \mathcal{H}_n$ and $X - \lambda I$ maps the small space bijectively on the large one. Next, in cases (ib) and (iia), one has $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{n}} \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$ and $X_{\overline{m},\overline{n}}$ is invertible, so that Proposition 3.1 applies. In particular the domain of X_0 is $D(X_0) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{n}} : Xf \in \mathcal{H}_0\}$.

In case (ia), consider the operator $X_{\overline{m},0}$, restriction to $\mathcal{H}_0$ of $X_{\overline{m},\overline{n}}$. The domain of X_0 is obtained by restriction of $X_{\overline{m},0} : \mathcal{H}_0 \to \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$, namely, $D(X_0) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_0 : Xf \in \mathcal{H}_0\}$. Thus one has $\mathcal{H}_m \subset D(X_0) \subset \mathcal{H}_0$, which confirms that $D(X_0)$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}_0$. The case (iib) is similar, passing to the dual spaces, except for the last statement. □

When performing the spectral analysis of a self-adjoint operator in a Hilbert space, the standard tool is the RHS formulation due to Maurin-Gel'fand [18, Chap. 1, §4] and also generalized by Roberts [22] and one of us [3]. In [12, Theor.4.4], a slightly more general version was given, which runs as follows.

Theorem 3.4. [12] *Let V_J be the scale built on the powers of the self-adjoint operator $A \geqslant I$,whose inverse A^{-1} is Hilbert-Schmidt. Assume that $(m, \overline{m}) \in \mathrm{j}(X)$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $X_{0,m}$, defined in (3.1), is densely defined and essentially self-adjoint. Then X has a complete set of generalized eigenvectors belonging to $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$.*

Remark : If A^{-1} is Hilbert-Schmidt, then A must have a purely point spectrum with finite multiplicity and $V^\# = D^\infty(A)$ is a nuclear Fréchet space.

It remains to combine Theorem 3.4 with the previous Proposition 3.2 to get a genuine generalization of the original Maurin-Gel'fand theorem.

Theorem 3.5. *Let V_J be the scale built on the powers of the self-adjoint operator $A \geqslant I$,whose inverse A^{-1} is Hilbert-Schmidt. Let $X = X^\times \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ be a symmetric operator. Assume that $(m, n) \in \mathrm{j}(X)$, with $\mathcal{H}_m \subset \mathcal{H}_o \subset \mathcal{H}_n$, and there is a $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $X - \lambda I$ has an invertible representative $(X - \lambda I)_{nm}$. Then, if either $m \leqslant \overline{n} \leqslant n$ or $\overline{n} \leqslant m \leqslant \overline{m}$, X_{nm} has a unique restriction to a self-adjoint operator X_0 in $\mathcal{H}$. In addition, possesses a complete set of generalized eigenvectors belonging to $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$, if $m \leqslant \overline{n}$, or to $\mathcal{H}_n$, if $m \geqslant \overline{n}$.*

Proof. The assumption $m \leqslant \overline{n} \leqslant n$ or $\overline{n} \leqslant m \leqslant \overline{m}$ means that we are in cases (ib), resp. (iia), among the four cases described above.

Let us proceed with case (ib). We have $\mathcal{H}_m \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$ and $X : \mathcal{H}_m \to \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$. The domain of X_0 is $D(X_0) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_m : Xf \in \mathcal{H}_0\}$, so that we can apply Theorem 3.4.

Let $\{E(\lambda)\}$ be the spectral family of the self-adjoint operator X_0 defined in Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.3, Given a unit vector $h \in \mathcal{H}$, put $\sigma(\lambda) = \langle E(\lambda)h|h\rangle$. Then, in virtue of [17, Ch. IV, Sect.4.3, Theor.1], σ defines a (Lebesgue-Stieltjes) measure on $\mathbb{R}$, such that the following derivative exists almost everywhere:

$$\chi_\lambda := \frac{\mathrm{d}E(\lambda)h}{\mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda)} \text{ a.e..}$$

Then χ_λ is a continuous conjugate linear functional on $V^\# = D^\infty(A)$, acting as

$$\chi_\lambda(f) \equiv \langle \chi_\lambda | f\rangle = \frac{\mathrm{d}\langle E(\lambda)h|f\rangle}{\mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda)} \text{ a.e., } f \in D^\infty(A).$$

This functional is a generalized eigenvector of X, corresponding to the (generalized) eigenvalue λ. These generalized eigenvectors form a complete system in the sense of Maurin-Gel'fand, that is, one has, for every $f, g \in V^\#$,

$$f = \int \overline{\langle \chi_\lambda | f\rangle}\, \chi_\lambda \, \mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda)\,,$$

$$\langle f|g\rangle = \int \overline{\langle \chi_\lambda | f\rangle}\, \langle \chi_\lambda | g\rangle \, \mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda)\,.$$

As for the generalized eigenvectors, the argument of [12, Theor.4.4] show that they belong to $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$ and form a complete set.

The case (iia) is entirely similar, with $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{n}} \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_n$, so that the operator X has now a complete set of generalized eigenvectors belonging to $\mathcal{H}_n$. □

As for the two other cases, we note

(ia) Here $D(X_0) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_0 : Xf \in \mathcal{H}_0\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_m \subset D(X_0)$, whereas $X : \mathcal{H}_m \to \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$; thus the domain $D(X_{0m}) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_m : Xf \in \mathcal{H}_0\}$ is contained in $D(X_0)$, and we don't know whether $X_0{\restriction}D(X_{0m})$ is essentially self-adjoint, so that Theorem 3.4 may not apply.

(iib) Same situation as (ia): $X : \mathcal{H}_{\overline{n}} \to \mathcal{H}_n$ and the domain $D(X_{0\overline{n}}) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{n}} : Xf \in \mathcal{H}_0\}$ is contained in $D(X_0)$.

3.2. Tight riggings

Let us go back to the scale built on the powers of the self-adjoint A. Let $m \geqslant 0 \geqslant n$ in Prop. 3.2, i.e., there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $X_{nm} - \lambda E_{nm} : \mathcal{H}_m \to \mathcal{H}_n$ is bijective, hence $[X_{nm} - \lambda E_{nm}]^{-1}$ is bounded. By Prop. 3.2, X_{nm} has a unique restriction X_0 which is a self-adjoint operator in $\mathcal{H}_0$. Its domain is $D(X_0) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_m : Xf \in \mathcal{H}\}$ and $\lambda \in \rho(X_0)$. Of course, if $n = 0, D(X_0) = \mathcal{H}_m$.

Let now $\mathcal{K} \subset D(X_0)$ be defined as $\mathcal{K} := \{f \in D(X_0) : X_0 f \in \mathcal{H}_m\}$. Put on $\mathcal{K}$ the graph norm of X_0 in $\mathcal{H}_m$:

$$\|g\|^2_{\mathcal{K}} := \|g\|^2_m + \|X_0 g\|^2_m\,.$$

Thus, assuming that K is dense in $\mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\mathcal{K} \subset D(X_0) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_m \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{K}^\times$$

and X_0 maps $\mathcal{K}$ continuously into $\mathcal{H}_m$. In other words, the pair $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H}_m)$ is admissible with respect to X_0, or is a rigging for X_0, in the sense of Babbitt [9] or Berezanskii [14, Chap. V, §2].

Let now $X_0^\dagger : \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}} \to \mathcal{K}^\times$ be the adjoint of X_0, defined by

$$\langle g|X_0^\dagger \Psi\rangle = \langle X_0 g|\Psi\rangle, \text{ for } g \in \mathcal{K}, \Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}.$$

Then $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{m}}$ is a *generalized eigenvector* for X_0, with *generalized eigenvalue* λ, if $X_0^\dagger \Psi = \lambda \Psi$.

Define $\sigma_{\mathrm{ext}}(X_0) := \sigma_{\mathcal{K},\mathcal{H}_m}(X_0) \supset \sigma(X_0)$, the *extended spectrum* of X_0, as the closure of the set of all generalized eigenvalues of X_0 for the rigging $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H}_m)$. Comparing with Definition 2.8, we get

$$\sigma(X_0) \subseteq \sigma_{\mathrm{ext}}(X_0) \subseteq \sigma^J(X).$$

Then one says that the rigging is *tight* if the two spectra σ and $\sigma_{\rm ext}$ coincide, that is, the rigging does not bring in new eigenvalues. To give a classical example, take $X_0 = -i\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. In the Schwartz RHS $\mathcal{S} \subset L^2 \subset \mathcal{S}^\times$, one gets a tight rigging, since $\sigma(X_0) = \sigma_{\rm ext}(X_0) = \mathbb{R}$ with generalized eigenvectors $\Psi_\lambda(x) = e^{i\lambda x} \in \mathcal{S}^\times$. But if one takes the RHS $\mathcal{D} \subset L^2 \subset \mathcal{D}^\times$, where $\mathcal{D}$ now denotes the Schwartz space of C^∞ functions of compact support, one obtains $\sigma_{\rm ext}(X_0) = \mathbb{C}$, with the same eigenvectors, which no not belong to $\mathcal{S}^\times$ if $\mathrm{Re}\,\lambda \neq 0$.

In this context, Babbitt [9, Lemma 2.2] shows that the rigging $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H}_m)$ is tight if and only if $(X_0 - \lambda I)\mathcal{K}$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}_m$ for every $\lambda \in \rho(X_0)$.

In the general case of an arbitrary LHS and $\mathcal{H}_m \subseteq \mathcal{H}_n$ in Prop. 3.2, one gets

$$\mathcal{K} \subset D(X_0) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{n}} \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_{n\vee\overline{m}} \subset \mathcal{K}^\times,$$

where $\mathcal{K} := \{f \in D(X_0) : X_0 f \in \mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{m}}\}$, with the graph norm from $\mathcal{H}_{m\wedge\overline{m}}$. One then proceeds as before.

Now we pose the following question: Given $X = X^\times \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, is it possible to construct a generalized resolution of the identity?

As we have seen in Theorem 3.5, to certain symmetric operators X of $\mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ there corresponds a complete family of generalized eigenvectors $\{\chi_\lambda\} \subset V$ in the sense that there exists a positive Borel measure σ on the real line such that

(i) $\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\langle\chi_\lambda|f\rangle|^2\,\mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda) < \infty, \quad \forall\, f \in V^\#,$

(ii) $\displaystyle f = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \overline{\langle\chi_\lambda|f\rangle}\chi_\lambda\,\mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda), \quad \forall\, f \in V^\#,$

(iii) $\displaystyle\langle f|g\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \overline{\langle\chi_\lambda|f\rangle}\langle\chi_\lambda|g\rangle\,\mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda), \quad \forall\, f, g \in V^\#,$

(iv) $\langle\chi_\lambda|Xf\rangle = \lambda\langle\chi_\lambda|f\rangle, \quad \forall\, f \in V^\#.$

Assume now that X is a symmetric operator of $\mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ possessing a complete family $\{\chi_\lambda\}$ of eigenvectors (i.e., (i)-(iv) hold) corresponding to real generalized eigenvalues λ's. If X maps $V^\#$ into itself, then by (iii) and (iv), we get, for $f, g \in V^\#$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Xf|g\rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \overline{\langle\chi_\lambda|Xf\rangle}\langle\chi_\lambda|g\rangle\,\mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda\,\overline{\langle\chi_\lambda|f\rangle}\langle\chi_\lambda|g\rangle\,\mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda).\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

This fact suggests the possibility of defining, as in the discrete case, an operator $B(\mu)$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, by

$$B(\mu)f = \int_{\alpha\leqslant\mu} \overline{\langle\chi_\alpha|f\rangle}\chi_\alpha\,\mathrm{d}\sigma(\alpha), \quad f \in V^\#.$$

Then each $B(\mu)$ is a symmetric element of $\mathrm{Op}(V_J)$. Indeed, it is a bounded symmetric operator in V_0, since it satisfies the relation $\langle B(\mu)f|f\rangle \leqslant \|f\|^2$, $\forall\, f \in V^\#$. Moreover, it is not difficult to check that the family $\{B(\mu)\}$ has the same properties of an ordinary spectral family, with the possible exception of idempotence. By the definition itself it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\langle\chi_\lambda|f\rangle}\langle\chi_\lambda|g\rangle\,\mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda) &= \mathrm{d}\int_{\alpha\leqslant\mu} \overline{\langle\chi_\alpha|f\rangle}\chi_\alpha\,\mathrm{d}\sigma(\alpha) \\ &= \mathrm{d}\langle B(\lambda)f|g\rangle, \quad \forall\, f, g \in V^\#.\end{aligned}$$

This allows to rewrite (3.6) in a more familiar form:

$$\langle Xf|g\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda\,\mathrm{d}\langle B(\lambda)f|g\rangle, \quad \forall\, f, g \in V^\#.$$

The assumption $XV^\# \subseteq V^\#$ can be weakened in an obvious way. Indeed, if $X : V^\# \to V_r$, $r \leqslant 0$, generalized eigenvectors, if they exist, live necessarily in $V_{\overline{r}}$ and a set of vectors $\{\chi_\lambda\}$ will be called complete if

(i') $\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\langle\chi_\lambda|f\rangle|^2\,\mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda) < \infty, \quad \forall\, f \in V_r,$

(ii) $\displaystyle f = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \overline{\langle\chi_\lambda|f\rangle}\chi_\lambda\,\mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda), \quad \forall\, f \in V_r,$

(iii) $\langle f|g\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \overline{\langle \chi_\lambda|f\rangle}\langle \chi_\lambda|g\rangle \, \mathrm{d}\sigma(\lambda), \quad \forall\, f, g \in V_r.$

In conclusion, we have

Proposition 3.6. *Let $X = X^\times \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$. Assume that $X : V^\# \to V_r$, $r \leqslant 0$ and that X has a complete family $\{\chi_\lambda\} \subset V_{\overline{r}}$ corresponding to real generalized eigenvalues λ's. Then there exists a generalized spectral family $\{B(\mu)\}$ such that*

$$\langle Xf|g\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda \, \mathrm{d}\langle B(\lambda)f|g\rangle, \quad \forall f \in V^\#, g \in V_{\overline{r}}.$$

We may remark that the family $\{B(\mu)\}$ is a generalized resolution of the identity in the sense of Naĭmark [1, Appendix] or [21, Appendix].

4. Examples

We give here some simple examples of singular symmetric operators in a LHS and discuss their spectral properties.

Example 4.1. Singular interactions in quantum mechanics

A typical Hamiltonian in (nonrelativistic) quantum mechanics takes the form $H = H_0 + V$, where the potential is the operator of multiplication M_V by the function V. If one chooses for potential a δ function, one gets a singular (zero range or point) interaction and the problem is to give a precise meaning to the symbolic expression : H "=" $H_0 + \delta$.

Such singular interactions are discussed in [5, Sec.7.1.3], namely, the description of quantum mechanical systems with local, many-center Hamiltonians, based on the original paper of Grossmann *et al.* [19]. We give here a simplified version of that example. Let $V = L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathrm{d}p)$ and let T be multiplication operator by the positive unbounded function $t(p)$, so that $\lambda = -1$ is a real point in the resolvent set of T (typically $t(p) = p^2$, that is, T is the free Hamiltonian). Then consider the scale $V_T := \{\mathcal{H}_r, r \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ built on the powers of $(T + I)^{1/2}$, where

$$\mathcal{H}_r(\mathbb{R}^\nu) := \{\phi \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^\nu) : \|\phi\|_r^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^\nu} \big(t(p) + 1\big)^r |\phi(p)|^2 \, \mathrm{d}p < \infty\}. \tag{4.1}$$

For $t(p) = p^2$, we get again the Sobolev spaces (or their Fourier transforms), so the scale (4.1) is again not nuclear. Thus Theorem 3.5 does not apply.

In particular, we will use the central part of the scale (4.1), namely,

$$\mathcal{H}_2 \subset \mathcal{H}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{1}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{2}} \, , \tag{4.2}$$

where as usual $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{r}} = \mathcal{H}_{-r}$. The free resolvent is the operator $R_\lambda(T) = (T - \lambda I)^{-1}$, that is, the operator of multiplication by $(t(p) - \lambda)^{-1}$, where λ belongs to the resolvent set $\rho(T) = \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, \infty)$. Then,
(i) Viewed as an operator in the central Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_0$, $R_\lambda(T)$ satisfies the identities

$$R_\lambda(T) - R_\mu(T) = (\lambda - \mu) R_\lambda(T) R_\mu(T), \tag{4.3}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}R_\lambda(T)}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} = R_\lambda(T)^2. \tag{4.4}$$

(ii) $R_\lambda(T) : \mathcal{H}_r \to \mathcal{H}_{r+2}$ is bounded with bounded inverse, and similarly for $R_\lambda(T)^{1/2} : \mathcal{H}_r \to \mathcal{H}_{r+1}$. Therefore, $\langle f|R_\lambda(T)g\rangle$ is well-defined for $f, g \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{1}}$, and $\langle f|R_\lambda(T)^2 g\rangle$ is well-defined for $f, g \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{2}}$. Clearly, these statements are in accordance with Proposition 2.9 (ii) or Theorem 2.11 (ii).

Formally, the Hamiltonian of a system with point interactions (δ-potential) will be written as $H = T + \sum_{j=1}^n c_j \delta(x_j)$. In order to give a proper definition of H as a PIP-space operator, we rewrite this in momentum representation as

$$H = T - \sum_{j=1}^n c_j |e_\nu^{x_j}\rangle\langle e_\nu^{x_j}|, \tag{4.5}$$

where the "potential" term is a dyadic operator in $\mathrm{Op}(V_T)$ (see Sec. A.2). The exponential functions, which correspond to δ functions in position representation, are

$$e_\nu^x(p) = (2\pi)^{-\nu/2} e^{ix\cdot p}, \; x, p \in \mathbb{R}^\nu.$$

The result depends on the dimension ν. Indeed one verifies immediately that

$$e_1^x \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{1}}(\mathbb{R}),\ e_\nu^x \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{2}}(\mathbb{R}^\nu) \setminus \mathcal{H}_{\overline{1}}(\mathbb{R}^\nu) \text{ for } \nu = 2,3; e_\nu^x \notin \mathcal{H}_{\overline{2}}(\mathbb{R}^\nu) \text{ for } \nu \geqslant 4.$$

More generally, given the set $\mathbf{\Phi} = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ of vectors from $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{2}}$ and an arbitrary $n \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{B} = [B_{ij}]$, one defines the operator

$$|\mathbf{\Phi}\rangle\mathbf{B}\langle\mathbf{\Phi}| := \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} B_{ij}|f_i\rangle\langle f_j|. \tag{4.6}$$

Using this notation, we can define the Hamiltonian H as T perturbed by a dyadic of the form (4.6). For the case of point interactions, one takes, of course, $f_j = e_\nu^{x_j}$.

Using this language, the following results are given in [19]. The first result covers the case of a mildly singular perturbation, that is, $f_k \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{1}}$, $k = 1, \dots, n$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\mathbf{\Phi} = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$, $f_k \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{1}}$, and let $\mathbf{B}$ be an invertible $n \times n$ matrix. Then the natural restriction of $H = T - |\mathbf{\Phi}\rangle\mathbf{B}\langle\mathbf{\Phi}|$ is a closed operator in $\mathcal{H}_0$. The resolvent of this operator is*

$$R_\lambda(H) = R_\lambda(T) - R_\lambda(T)|\mathbf{\Phi}\rangle\Gamma(\lambda)^{-1}\langle\mathbf{\Phi}|R_\lambda(T),$$

where $R_\lambda(T)$ is the resolvent of T and $\Gamma(\lambda) = \langle\mathbf{\Phi}|R_\lambda(T)\mathbf{\Phi}\rangle - \mathbf{B}^{-1}$. If $\mathbf{B}$ is Hermitian, then H is self-adjoint. The points in $\sigma(H)$ that do not belong to $\sigma(T) = [0, \infty)$, i.e., the eigenvalues of H (bound states) are the solutions of the equation $\det\Gamma(\lambda) = 0$. There are at most n real such points. In addition, $\Gamma(\lambda)$ can be continued analytically to a Riemann surface and the zeros of this extension will give resonances.

By 'natural restriction', we mean, of course, restriction in the sense of PIP-space operators, as in Proposition 3.1. The case of the δ-potentials corresponds to $\mathbf{B}_{ij} = \delta_{ij}c_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f_j = e_\nu^{x_j}$. In the one center case, $n = 1$, the Hamiltonian is $H = T - c\,|e_\nu^x\rangle\langle e_\nu^x|$, with resolvent

$$R_\lambda(H) = R_\lambda(T) - \Gamma(\lambda)^{-1}\,R_\lambda(T)|e_\nu^x\rangle\langle e_\nu^x|R_\lambda(T).$$

From this formula, one can deduce all the spectral properties of H. For instance, in one dimension, with $t(p) = p^2$, one has $\Gamma(\lambda) = \langle e_1^x|R_\lambda(T)e_1^x\rangle - c^{-1} = 1/2\kappa - \alpha$, where $\alpha = c^{-1}$ and $\kappa^2 = -\lambda$, $\operatorname{Re}\kappa \geqslant 0$. Thus, for $\alpha > 0$, H has a bound state for $\kappa_b = 1/2\alpha$, i.e., energy $E_b \equiv \lambda_b = -1/4\alpha^2$. As $\alpha \to 0$, κ_b tends to ∞ and turns into a resonance when $\alpha < 0$.

Whenever at least one $f_k \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{2}} \setminus \mathcal{H}_{\overline{1}}$, a case called 'strongly singular', the restriction of $H = T - |\mathbf{\Phi}\rangle\mathbf{B}\langle\mathbf{\Phi}|$ is no longer self-adjoint, but it admits a family of n^2 self-adjoint extensions. This is, for instance, the case of point interactions in dimension 3. The details may be found in [5, Sec.7.1.3] and in the original paper [19].

Example 4.3. Multiplication by a Dirac δ in $\mathcal{S} \subset L^2 \subset \mathcal{S}^\times$

This example is treated in [12, Ex.5.1]. The operator M_δ is defined by the relation

$$\langle M_\delta f|g\rangle = \langle \delta f|g\rangle = f(0)g(0),\ \forall\, f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Clearly, the only condition to impose on f is that it must be continuous at the origin. Thus the natural LHS for this problem is the scale of Sobolev spaces $V_J = \{W^{k,2},\ k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ [5, Ex.5.4.21], with norms

$$\|f\|_{k,2} = \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(1 + |\xi|^2\big)^k |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2\ \mathrm{d}\xi\Big)^{1/2} = \Big\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\big((1 + |\cdot|^2)^{k/2}\mathcal{F}(f)\big)\Big\|_2\ .$$

Note that $V_J^\# = \cap_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} W^{k,2}$ is *not* nuclear, since the embedding of any of the spaces into a bigger one, which is a multiplication operator, cannot be Hilbert-Schmidt. However we can complete the scheme with Schwartz spaces and get

$$\mathcal{S} \subset V_J^\# \subset W^{0,2} = L^2 \subset V_J \subset \mathcal{S}^\times\,,$$

which is the standard RHS used for analyzing singular operators.

In the context of V_J, the analysis of [12] shows that the operator M_δ is symmetric, has 0 as unique eigenvalue and J-spectrum $\sigma^J(M_\delta) = \mathbb{C}$.

Example 4.4. Multiplication by an increasing function in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$

Taking again the Schwartz RHS $\mathcal{S} \subset L^2 \subset \mathcal{S}^\times$, we consider the operator of multiplication M_Φ by a

tempered distribution Φ. This case has been treated in [12], but only when Φ is given by a measurable, slowly increasing real function h, using again the Sobolev scale. Thus M_h is defined by

$$\langle M_h f|g\rangle = \langle h|\overline{f}g\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(x)f(x)\overline{g(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x,\ f,g\in\mathcal{S}.$$

First, $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$ can be a genuine eigenvalue of M_h only if $h(x)=a$ a.e., for some $a\in\mathbb{R}$, and then $\sigma(M_h)=\sigma_p(M_h)=\{a\}$. Next, the resolvent of M_h is the operator of multiplication by $g=(h-\lambda)^{-1}$.

Assume first that h is bounded. Then, coming back to the Sobolev scale $V_J=\{W^{k,2},\,k\in\mathbb{Z}\}$, the analysis of [12] shows that $\rho^{(k,m)}(M_h)=\emptyset,\ \forall\, k,m\in\mathbb{Z}$, except for $\rho^{(0,0)}(M_h)=\mathbb{C}\setminus\overline{h(\mathbb{R})}$, where $\overline{h(\mathbb{R})}$ is the closure of the essential range of h. Thus $\rho^J(M_h)=\mathbb{C}\setminus\overline{h(\mathbb{R})}$ and $\sigma^J(M_h)=\sigma(M_h)=\sigma_c(M_h)=\sigma_{\rm ext}(M_h)=\overline{h(\mathbb{R})}$.

On the contrary, if h is slowly increasing and unbounded, such as $h(x)=x$, then again $\rho^{(k,m)}(M_h)=\emptyset,\ \forall\, k,m\in\mathbb{Z}$, without exception, so that $\rho^J(M_h)=\emptyset$ and $\sigma^J(M_h)=\mathbb{C}$, whereas $\sigma(M_h)=\sigma_c(M_h)=\sigma_{\rm ext}(M_h)=\overline{h(\mathbb{R})}$.

Thus, in both cases, we have a tight rigging.

Example 4.5. Multipliers in sequence spaces

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a separable Hilbert space, with an orthonormal basis $\{e_n, n=0,1,2\ldots\}$. Then the space $\mathcal{H}$ is unitary equivalent to the space ℓ^2 of square integrable sequences, with the usual inner product, via the representation $f=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n e_n$. Assume now there is a LHS $\{\mathcal{H}_n, n\in\mathbb{Z}\}$ with central Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_0=\mathcal{H}$. Correspondingly, we get a LHS $\{\mathfrak{H}_n, n\in\mathbb{Z}\}$ of sequence spaces around ℓ^2. The typical example is the Schwartz RHS $\mathcal{S}\subset L^2\subset\mathcal{S}^\times$, unitary equivalent to the RHS of sequences $s\subset\ell^2\subset s^\times$ via the basis of Hermite functions. In order to introduce a LHS interpolating between s and $s^\times$, consider the Hilbert spaces s_m defined as follows, for every $m\in\mathbb{Z}$:

$$(f_n)\in s_m \iff \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}|f_n|^2(n+1)^m<\infty. \tag{4.7}$$

Then s_m is a space of decreasing sequences if $m>0$ and a space of slowly increasing sequences if $m<0$, the duality reads $(s_m)^\times=s_{\overline{m}}$ and one has, as announced,

$$s=\bigcap_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} s_m \quad\text{and}\quad s^\times=\bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} s_m. \tag{4.8}$$

Now consider in $s^\times$ a multiplier [10], that is, an operator $A^{(k)}$ given by $(A^{(k)}c)_n=a_n\,c_n$, $c=(c_n)$, where the sequence (a_n) satisfies the conditions

$$|a_n|>0,\ \forall\, n,\quad\text{and}\quad |a_n|\leqslant (n+1)^{k/2},\ \forall\, n \text{ and some } k\in\mathbb{Z}. \tag{4.9}$$

It follows that $A^{(k)}$ maps s_m continuously into s_{m-k}, for every $m\in\mathbb{Z}$. If $k\gg 1$, $A^{(k)}$ is a very singular operator. Let now $m>0$ and $k=2m$. Then $A^{(2m)}$ maps s_m into $s_{\overline{m}}$, so that Theorem 3.5 applies. If every a_n is real and positive, $A^{(2m)}$ is positive and symmetric in the scale $V_J=\{s_m,\,m\in\mathbb{Z}\}$, every vector e_j in the canonical basis of ℓ^2 is an eigenvector of $A^{(2m)}$, with eigenvalue a_j. Thus $\sigma(A^{(2m)})=\sigma_p(A^{(2m)})=\sigma_{\rm ext}(A^{(2m)})=\overline{\{a_j,\,j\in\mathbb{N}\}}$. In other words, we have a tight rigging.

The preceding example can be generalized to arbitrary weighted sequences, following the discussion in [7] and in particular [8, Sect.3.3]. Given an orthonormal basis $(e_n), n\in\mathbb{N}$, in $\mathcal{H}$, define the sequences $(\psi_n),(\phi_n)$, with $\psi_n:=m_n^{-1}e_n$, $\phi_n:=m_n e_n$, where $m^{-1}=(m_n^{-1})\in\ell^\infty$ has a subsequence converging to zero and $m_n\neq 0,\ \forall\, n$. Hence the former is an upper semi-frame and not a frame, that is, it satisfies the upper frame bound, but not the lower one:

$$0<\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}|\langle f|\psi_n\rangle|^2\leq \mathsf{M}\,\|f\|^2,\forall\, f\in\mathcal{H},\ f\neq 0. \tag{4.10}$$

The frame operator associated to the sequence (ψ_n), defined by

$$Sf=\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\langle f|\psi_n\rangle\psi_n,$$

is diagonal, namely, $S = \mathrm{diag}(m_n^{-2})$. Thus $S^{-1} = \mathrm{diag}(m_n^2)$, which is clearly unbounded, and $\psi_n = S^{-1}\phi_n$. Considering the scale built on the powers of $S^{-1/2}$, one gets for the central triplet

$$\mathcal{H}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}_0 = \ell^2 \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{1}}.$$

The norm of $\mathcal{H}_k, k = 1, 0, \overline{1}$, reads as:

$$\|f\|_k^2 = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} m_n^{2k}|f_n|^2,\ k = 1, 0, \overline{1}.$$

Next one can consider the full scale $\{\mathcal{H}_j, j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ associated to $S^{-1/2}$ and try to identify the end spaces. For instance, if the sequence (m_n) grows polynomially, one gets the same result: the end spaces $\mathcal{H}_\infty(S^{-1/2}) = \bigcap_j \mathcal{H}_j$, resp. $\mathcal{H}_{-\infty}(S^{-1/2}) = \bigcup_j \mathcal{H}_j$, still coincide with s and $s^\times$, respectively.

In that more general context, multipliers can be defined exactly as in the Schwartz case, with similar results. Let again $A^{(k)} : (f_n) \mapsto (a_n\, f_n)$, with

$$|a_n| > 0,\ \forall\, n, \quad \text{and} \quad |a_n| \leqslant c\,(m_n)^k,\ \forall\, n \text{ and some } k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Then $A^{(k)}$ maps $\mathcal{H}_j$ continuously into $\mathcal{H}_{m-k}$, for every $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let now $r > 0$ and $k = 2r$. Then $A^{(2r)}$ maps $\mathcal{H}_r$ into $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{r}}$, so that Theorem 3.5 applies. If every a_n is real and positive, $A^{(2r)}$ is positive and symmetric in the scale $V_J = \{\mathcal{H}_j,\, j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, every vector e_n in the canonical basis of ℓ^2 is an eigenvector of $A^{(2r)}$, with eigenvalue a_n. Thus $\sigma(A^{(2r)}) = \sigma_p(A^{(2r)}) = \sigma_{\mathrm{ext}}(A^{(2r)}) = \overline{\{a_n,\, n \in \mathbb{N}\}}$. In other words, we have again a tight rigging.

One may note that the operator $S^{-1/2} : \mathcal{H}_j \to \mathcal{H}_{j-1}$ itself is a (mild) multiplier. Even $S^{-1} : \mathcal{H}_1 \to \mathcal{H}_{\overline{1}}$ fits in the scheme above.

Another generalization consists in starting from a generalized Riesz basis, in the sense of [13], instead of an orthonormal basis. Take again a triplet of Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_{\overline{1}}$, with $T : \mathcal{H}_1 \to \mathcal{H}_0$ a continuous, invertible operator, with bounded inverse $T^{-1} : \mathcal{H}_0 \to \mathcal{H}_1$. Then $\{f_n\}$ is a (tight) generalized Riesz basis for $\mathcal{H}_1$ if $\{Tf_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{H}_0$. It follows that $\{f_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{H}_1$ and the norm of the latter is $\|f\|_1 = \|Tf\|_0$. Since T is an unbounded operator in $\mathcal{H}_0$, with dense domain $\mathcal{H}_1$, we may again consider the scale built on the powers of T, namely, $\{\mathcal{H}_j, j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, where $\mathcal{H}_j = D(T^j)$ with norm $\|f\|_j = \left\|T^j f\right\|_0$. In that case, multipliers can be defined as before. In particular, the operator R^α of [13, Sec.4], defined for $f \in \mathcal{H}_1$ by

$$R^\alpha f = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n \langle f|\psi_n\rangle\psi_n,\ \alpha = (\alpha_n),\ \alpha_n \in \mathbb{C},$$

is such a multiplier.

Example 4.6. Multipliers in continuous (semi-)frames

A construction corresponding to that of Schwartz sequence spaces may be made around L^2 by considering the Hilbert scale built on the powers of $H_{\mathrm{osc}} := -\,\mathrm{d}^2/\,\mathrm{d}x^2 + x^2$, namely the Hamiltonian of the quantum harmonic oscillator. In that case one interpolates between $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}^\times$ by a scale of Hilbert spaces, which are essentially Sobolev-type spaces.

A different approach consists in generalizing the semi-frame context to continuous upper semi-frames, following [8, Sect.5.2], or that of multipliers for continuous frames [11]. Let us summarize the first method.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space and X a locally compact space with measure ν. Then a *continuous upper semi-frame* for $\mathcal{H}$ is a family of vectors $\Psi := \{\psi_x,\, x \in X\}$, $\psi_x \in \mathcal{H}$, indexed by points of X, such that the map $x \mapsto \langle f|\psi_x\rangle$ is measurable, $\forall\, f \in \mathcal{H}$, and there exists $\mathsf{M} < \infty$ such that

$$0 < \int_X |\langle f|\psi_x\rangle|^2\ \mathrm{d}\nu(x) \leqslant \mathsf{M}\,\|f\|^2\,,\ \forall\, f \in \mathcal{H},\ f \neq 0. \tag{4.11}$$

Define the analysis operator by the (coherent state) map $C_\Psi : \mathcal{H} \to L^2(X,\, \mathrm{d}\nu)$ given by

$$(C_\Psi f)(x) = \langle f|\psi_x\rangle,\ f \in \mathcal{H},$$

with adjoint $C_\Psi^* : L^2(X,\, \mathrm{d}\nu) \to \mathcal{H}$, called the synthesis operator. Then the frame operator is $S := C_\Psi^* C_\Psi$ and $\|C_\Psi f\|^2_{L^2(X)} = \|S^{1/2} f\|^2_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle Sf|f\rangle$. Furthermore, C_Ψ is injective, by virtue of the lower bound, so that $C_\Psi^{-1} : \mathrm{Ran}(C_\Psi) \to \mathcal{H}$ is well-defined. Thus, Ψ is a total set in $\mathcal{H}$, the operators C_Ψ and S are bounded, S

is injective and self-adjoint. Therefore $\mathrm{Ran}(S)$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$, S^{-1} is also self-adjoint, but unbounded, with dense domain $D(S^{-1}) = \mathrm{Ran}(S)$.

Consider now the operators $G := C_\Psi\, S\, C_\Psi^{-1} = C_\Psi C_\Psi^*$ and $G^{-1} := C_\Psi\, S^{-1}\, C_\Psi^{-1} = C_\Psi^{*\,-1} C_\Psi^{-1}$, both acting in the Hilbert space $\overline{\mathrm{Ran}(C_\Psi)}$, the closure of $\mathrm{Ran}(C_\Psi)$ in $L^2(X,\, \mathrm{d}\nu)$. Both operators are self-adjoint and positive, G is bounded and G^{-1} is densely defined in $\overline{\mathrm{Ran}(C_\Psi)}$. Furthermore, they are are inverse of each other on the appropriate domains.

Next one shows [2] that $\mathrm{Ran}(C_\Psi)$ is complete in the norm

$$\|F\|_\Psi^2 := \langle GF|F\rangle_{L^2(X)} = \left\|C_\Psi^{-1} F\right\|_{L^2(X)}^2,$$

hence it is a Hilbert space, denoted by $\mathfrak{H}_\Psi$, and the map $C_\Psi : \mathcal{H} \to \mathfrak{H}_\Psi$ is unitary. Moreover, since the spectrum of G^{-1} is bounded away from zero, the norm $\|\cdot\|_\Psi$ is equivalent to the graph norm of $G^{-1/2} = \left(G^{-1}\right)^{1/2}$.

Proceeding as in the discrete case, one obtains, with continuous and dense range embeddings,

$$\mathfrak{H}_\Psi \;\subset\; \mathfrak{H}_0 \;\subset\; \mathfrak{H}_\Psi^\times, \tag{4.12}$$

where

- $\mathfrak{H}_\Psi = \mathrm{Ran}(C_\Psi)$, which is a Hilbert space for the norm $\|\cdot\|_\Psi = \langle G^{-1}\cdot\,|\,\cdot\rangle_{L^2}^{1/2}$;
- $\mathfrak{H}_0 = \overline{\mathfrak{H}_\Psi} = \overline{\mathrm{Ran}(C_\Psi)}$ is the closure of $\mathfrak{H}_\Psi$ in $L^2(X,\, \mathrm{d}\nu)$;
- $\mathfrak{H}_\Psi^\times$ is the completion of $\mathfrak{H}_0$ (or $\mathfrak{H}_\Psi$) in the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\Psi^\times} := \langle G\cdot\,|\,\cdot\rangle_{L^2}^{1/2}$, and the conjugate dual of $\mathfrak{H}_\Psi$.

In particular, (4.12) is the central triplet of the scale of Hilbert spaces generated by the powers of $G^{-1/2}$, namely, $\mathfrak{H}_j := D(G^{-j/2}), j \in \mathbb{Z}$. A concrete example, given originally in [8, Sect.5.2], is summarized below. In this approach, multipliers can be defined exactly as in the discrete case.

Note that, if Ψ is a frame, both S^{-1} and G^{-1} are bounded and the three spaces in (4.12) coincide, with equivalent norms, and therefore the scale collapses. This is the case, for instance, in the standard examples such as Gabor (or STFT) multipliers or wavelet multipliers (which are then called Calderón-Toeplitz operators). Although such examples are too nice for the present considerations, they have led to a considerable field of research, under the names of time-frequency localization operators or anti-Wick operators. We refer to [11] for a comprehensive list of references.

However, we prefer to follow the formulation of [11]. Let Ψ and Φ be two upper semi-frames (called Bessel mappings in [11]) and $m : X \to \mathbb{C}$ a measurable function. Then the operator $\mathbf{M}_{m,\Psi,\Phi} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ defined in the weak sense by

$$\mathbf{M}_{m,\Psi,\Phi} f := \int_X m(x) \langle f|\psi_x\rangle \phi_x \; \mathrm{d}\nu(x), \tag{4.13}$$

is called a continuous Bessel multiplier for Ψ and Φ, with symbol m. If $m \in L^\infty(X,\, \mathrm{d}\nu)$, the corresponding multiplier is a bounded operator. Clearly one has

$$\mathbf{M}_{m,\Psi,\Phi} = C_\Phi^*\, M_m\, C_\Psi,$$

where M_m is the operator of multiplication by m in $L^2(X,\, \mathrm{d}\nu)$. It follows that $(\mathbf{M}_{m,\Psi,\Phi})^* = \mathbf{M}_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$. Hence we will consider only the case $\Phi = \Psi$, so that the corresponding multiplier $\mathbf{M}_{m,\Psi} := \mathbf{M}_{m,\Psi,\Psi}$ is a symmetric operator in the scale defined by Ψ.

For m bounded, the operator $\mathbf{M}_{m,\Psi}$ is bounded, but cannot be compact. In order to generate a compact multiplier, the symbol m must be bounded and vanishing at infinity and, in addition, Ψ must be norm bounded, i.e., $\|\psi_x\| \leqslant M$, for some constant $M > 0$ and almost every $x \in X$. Furthermore, under the same conditions, $m \in L^p(X,\, \mathrm{d}\nu), 1 < p < \infty$, implies that $\mathbf{M}_{m,\Psi}$ belongs to the Schatten class $\mathcal{C}^p$. Thus, in order to obtain a singular operator, unbounded or worse, we have to take for m an unbounded function or even a distribution. But then we are back to Example 4.4, albeit in a general Hilbert scale, generated by an arbitrary upper semi-frame.

To get an example, consider the upper semi-frame Ψ introduced in [7, 8], which consists of affine coherent states. Here the Hilbert space is $\mathcal{H}^{(n)} := L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, r^{n-1}\, \mathrm{d}r), n =$ integer $\geqslant 1$. The vectors ψ_x are indexed by $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and are given by

$$\psi_x(r) = e^{-ixr}\, \psi(r), \quad r \in \mathbb{R}^+,$$

where ψ is admissible if it satisfies the two conditions

$$(i)\ \sup_{r\in\mathbb{R}^+}\mathfrak{s}(r)=1, \text{where } \mathfrak{s}(r):=2\pi r^{n-1}|\psi(r)|^2$$
$$(ii)\ |\psi(r)|^2\neq 0, \text{ except perhaps at isolated points } r\in\mathbb{R}^+.$$

The frame operator S and its inverse S^{-1} are multiplication operators on $\mathcal{H}^{(n)}$, namely

$$(S^{\pm1}f)(r)=[\mathfrak{s}(r)]^{\pm1}f(r).$$

Since $\mathfrak{s}(r)\leqslant 1$, the inverse S^{-1} is indeed unbounded and no frame vector ψ_x belongs to its domain. Thus the scale generated by $S^{-1/2}$ consists of the spaces $\mathcal{H}_k=D(S^{-k/2}), k\in\mathbb{Z}$, with squared norms

$$\|f\|_k^2=\langle S^{-k}f|f\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^{(n)}}=\int_0^\infty |f(r)|^2\,[\mathfrak{s}(r)]^{-k}\,r^{n-1}\,\mathrm{d}r.$$

In the same way, one has

$$(G^{\pm1}F)(x)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^+}e^{ixr}\,\widehat{F}(r)\,[\mathfrak{s}(r)]^{\pm1}\,\mathrm{d}r,$$

and, for every $j\in\mathbb{Z}$, $j\neq 0$,

$$(G^{j}F)(x)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^+}\widehat{F}(r)\,[\mathfrak{s}(r)]^{j}\,\mathrm{d}r.$$

Accordingly, the associated Hilbert scale consists of the spaces $\mathfrak{H}_j=D(G^{-j/2}), j\in\mathbb{Z}$, with squared norm

$$\|F\|_j^2=\langle G^{-j}F|F\rangle_{L^2}=\int_0^\infty e^{ixr}\,|\widehat{F}(r)|^2\,[\mathfrak{s}(r)]^{-j}\,\mathrm{d}r,\ j\in\mathbb{Z},\ j\neq 0.$$

However, the end spaces of either scale do not seem to have an easy interpretation.

On the scale $\{\mathcal{H}_k, k\in\mathbb{Z}\}$, a multiplier reads as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{M}_{m,\Phi}f(r)&=\int_{\mathbb{R}}m(x)\langle f|\psi_x\rangle\,\psi_x(r)\,\mathrm{d}x,\\&=\psi(r)\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{-ixr}m(x)\langle f|\psi_x\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x\\&=\psi(r)\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{-ixr}m(x)\int_0^\infty f(s)\,e^{ixs}\,\overline{\psi(s)}\,s^{n-1}\,\mathrm{d}s\\&=\sqrt{2\pi}\,\psi(r)\int_0^\infty f(s)\,\overline{\psi(s)}\,\widehat{m}(r-s)\,s^{n-1}\,\mathrm{d}s,\end{aligned}$$

where we have freely interchanged the integrals and $\widehat{m}$ is the Fourier transform of m.

Take for instance $m=\delta$, so that $\widehat{m}(s)=1/\sqrt{2\pi}$. Then $\mathbf{M}_{m,\Phi}f(r)=\psi(r)\langle f|\psi\rangle$, that is, $\mathbf{M}_{\delta,\Phi}$ is simply the orthogonal projection on ψ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, r^{n-1}\,\mathrm{d}r)$.

Appendix A. Partial inner product spaces

A.1. PIP-spaces and indexed PIP-spaces

For the convenience of the reader, we have collected here the main features of partial inner product spaces and operators on them, keeping only what is needed for reading the paper. Further information may be found in our monograph [5] or our review paper [6].

The general framework is that of a PIP-space V, corresponding to the linear compatibility $\#$, that is, a symmetric binary relation $f\#g$ which preserves linearity. We call *assaying subspace* of V a subspace S such that $S^{\#\#}=S$ and we denote by $\mathcal{F}(V,\#)$ the family of all assaying subspaces of V, ordered by inclusion. The assaying subspaces are denoted by $V_r, V_q, \ldots$ and the index set is F. By definition, $q\leqslant r$ if and only if $V_q\subseteq V_r$. Thus we may write

$$f\#g\ \Leftrightarrow\ \exists\, r\in F \text{ such that } f\in V_r, g\in V_{\overline{r}}. \tag{A.1}$$

General considerations [16] imply that the family $\mathcal{F}(V,\#):=\{V_r, r\in F\}$, ordered by inclusion, is a complete involutive lattice, i.e., it is stable under the following operations, arbitrarily iterated:

. involution: $V_r\ \leftrightarrow\ V_{\overline{r}}=(V_r)^{\#}$,
. infimum: $V_{p\wedge q}\ :=\ V_p\wedge V_q=V_p\cap V_q, \qquad (p,q,r\in F)$
. supremum: $V_{p\vee q}\ :=\ V_p\vee V_q=(V_p+V_q)^{\#\#}$.

The smallest element of $\mathcal{F}(V,\#)$ is $V^\# = \bigcap_r V_r$ and the greatest element is $V = \bigcup_r V_r$.

By definition, the index set F is also a complete involutive lattice; for instance,

$$(V_{p\wedge q})^\# = V_{\overline{p\wedge q}} = V_{\overline{p}\vee\overline{q}} = V_{\overline{p}} \vee V_{\overline{q}}.$$

Given a vector space V equipped with a linear compatibility $\#$, a *partial inner product* on $(V,\#)$ is a Hermitian form $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$ defined exactly on compatible pairs of vectors. A *partial inner product space* (PIP-space) is a vector space V equipped with a linear compatibility and a partial inner product.

From now on, we will assume that our PIP-space $(V,\#,\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle)$ is *nondegenerate*, that is, $\langle f|g\rangle = 0$ for all $f \in V^\#$ implies $g = 0$. As a consequence, $(V^\#, V)$ and every couple $(V_r, V_{\overline{r}})$, $r \in F$, are a dual pair in the sense of topological vector spaces [20]. Next we assume that every V_r carries its Mackey topology $\tau(V_r, V_{\overline{r}})$, so that its conjugate dual is $(V_r)^\times = V_{\overline{r}},\ \forall\, r \in F$. Then, $r < s$ implies $V_r \subset V_s$, and the embedding operator $E_{sr} : V_r \to V_s$ is continuous and has dense range. In particular, $V^\#$ is dense in every V_r. In the sequel, we also assume the partial inner product to be positive definite, $\langle f|f\rangle > 0$ whenever $f \neq 0$.

In fact, the whole structure can be reconstructed from a fairly small subset of $\mathcal{F}$, namely, a *generating* involutive sublattice $\mathcal{J}$ of $\mathcal{F}(V,\#)$, indexed by J, which means that

$$f\#g \ \Leftrightarrow\ \exists\, r \in J \text{ such that } f \in V_r, g \in V_{\overline{r}}. \tag{A.2}$$

The resulting structure is called an *indexed* PIP*-space* and denoted simply by $V_J := (V, \mathcal{J}, \langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle)$.

For practical applications, it is essentially sufficient to restrict oneself to the case of an indexed PIP-space satisfying the following conditions:

(i) every $V_r, r \in J$, is a Hilbert space or a reflexive Banach space, so that the Mackey topology $\tau(V_r, V_{\overline{r}})$ coincides with the norm topology;
(ii) there is a unique self-dual, Hilbert, assaying subspace $V_o = V_{\overline{o}}$.
(iii) for every $V_r \in \mathcal{J}$, the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\overline{r}}$ on $V_{\overline{r}} = V_r^\times$ is the conjugate of the norm $\|\cdot\|_r$ on V_r. In particular, the partial inner product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$ coincides with the inner product of V_o on the latter.

In that case, the *indexed* PIP*-space* $V_J := (V, \mathcal{J}, \langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle)$ is called, respectively, a *lattice of Hilbert spaces* (LHS) or a *lattice of Banach spaces* (LBS). This implies, in addition, that, for a LHS:

(i) for every pair $V_p, V_q \in \mathcal{J}$, the norm on $V_{p\wedge q} := V_p \cap V_q$ is equivalent to the projective norm, given by

$$\|f\|^2_{p\wedge q} = \|f\|^2_p + \|f\|^2_q, \tag{A.3}$$

(ii) for every pair $V_p, V_q \in \mathcal{J}$, the norm on $V_{p\vee q} := V_p + V_q$, the vector sum, is equivalent to the inductive norm

$$\|f\|^2_{p\vee q} = \inf_{f=g+h} \left(\|g\|^2_p + \|h\|^2_q\right),\ g \in V_p, f \in V_q\,. \tag{A.4}$$

Similar formulas are used in the LBS case, simply omitting the squares. These norms come from interpolation theory [15].

Note that $V^\#, V$ themselves usually do *not* belong to the family $\{V_r,\, r \in J\}$, but they can be recovered as

$$V^\# = \bigcap_{r\in J} V_r, \quad V = \sum_{r\in J} V_r.$$

A standard, albeit trivial, example is that of a Rigged Hilbert space (RHS) $\Phi \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \Phi^\#$ (it is trivial because the lattice $\mathcal{F}$ contains only three elements).

Familiar concrete examples are sequence spaces, with $V = \omega$ the space of *all* complex sequences $x = (x_n)$, and spaces of locally integrable functions with $V = L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R},\, \mathrm{d}x)$, the space of Lebesgue measurable functions, integrable over compact subsets.

A.2. Operators on indexed PIP-spaces

Let V_J be a nondegenerate indexed PIP-space (in particular, a LHS or a LBS). Then an *operator* on V_J is a map from a subset $\mathcal{D}(A) \subset V$ into V, such that

(i) $\mathcal{D}(A) = \bigcup_{q\in \mathsf{d}(A)} V_q$, where $\mathsf{d}(A)$ is a nonempty subset of J;

(ii) For every $q \in \mathsf{d}(A)$, there exists $p \in J$ such that the restriction of A to V_q is a continuous linear map into V_p (we denote this restriction by A_{pq});

(iii) A has no proper extension satisfying (i) and (ii).

We denote by $\mathrm{Op}(V_J,)$ the set of all operators on V_J . The continuous linear operator $A_{pq} : V_q \to V_p$ is called a *representative* of A. The properties of A are conveniently described by the set $\mathsf{j}(A)$ of all pairs $(q,p) \in J \times J$ such that A maps V_q continuously into V_p Thus the operator A may be identified with the collection of its representatives,

$$A \simeq \{A_{pq} : V_q \to V_p : (q,p) \in \mathsf{j}(A)\}. \tag{A.5}$$

It is important to notice that an operator is uniquely determined by *any* of its representatives, in virtue of Property (iii): there are no extensions for PIP-space operators.

We will also need the following sets:

$$\mathsf{d}(A) = \{q \in J : \text{there is a } p \text{ such that } A_{pq} \text{ exists}\},$$
$$\mathsf{i}(A) = \{p \in J : \text{there is a } q \text{ such that } A_{pq} \text{ exists}\}.$$

The following properties are immediate:

- $\mathsf{d}(A)$ is an initial subset of J: if $q \in \mathsf{d}(A)$ and $q' < q$, then $q' \in \mathsf{d}(A)$, and $A_{pq'} = A_{pq}E_{qq'}$, where $E_{qq'}$ is a representative of the unit operator.
- $\mathsf{i}(A)$ is a final subset of J: if $p \in \mathsf{i}(A)$ and $p' > p$, then $p' \in \mathsf{i}(A)$ and $A_{p'q} = E_{p'p}A_{pq}$.

Although an operator may be identified with a separately continous sesquilinear form on $V^\# \times V^\#$, or a conjugate linear, continuous map $V^\#$ into V it is more useful to keep also the *algebraic operations* on operators, namely:

(i) *Adjoint:* every $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ has a unique adjoint $A^\times \in \mathrm{Op}V_J)$, defined by

$$\langle A^\times y|x\rangle = \langle y|Ax\rangle, \text{ for } x \in V_q,\ q \in \mathsf{d}(A) \text{ and } y \in V_{\overline{p}},\ p \in \mathsf{i}(A), \tag{A.6}$$

that is, $(A^\times)_{\overline{qp}} = (A_{pq})'$, where $(A_{pq})' : V_{\overline{p}} \to V_{\overline{q}}$ is the adjoint map of A_{pq}. Furthermore, one has $A^{\times\times} = A$, for every $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$: no extension is allowed, by the maximality condition (iii) of the definition.

(ii) *Partial multiplication:* Let $A, B \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$. We say that the product BA is defined if and only if there is a $r \in \mathsf{i}(A) \cap \mathsf{d}(B)$, that is, if and only if there is a continuous factorization through some V_r:

$$V_q \overset{A}{\to} V_r \overset{B}{\to} V_p, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad (BA)_{pq} = B_{pr}A_{rq}, \text{ for some } q \in \mathsf{d}(A), p \in \mathsf{i}(B). \tag{A.7}$$

Of particular interest are *symmetric* operators, defined as those operators satisfying the relation $A^\times = A$, since these are the ones that could generate self-adjoint operators in the central Hilbert space, for instance by the celebrated KLMN theorem, suitably generalized to the PIP-space environment [5, Section 3.3].

Concerning the adjoint, we note that $\mathsf{j}(A^\times) = \mathsf{j}^\times(A) := \{(\overline{p},\overline{q}) : (q,p) \in \mathsf{j}(A)\} \subset J \times J$. Also, $\mathsf{j}(A^\times)$ is obtained by reflecting $\mathsf{j}(A)$ with respect to the anti-diagonal $\{(r,\overline{r}), r \in J\}$. In particular, if A is symmetric, $\mathsf{j}(A)$ is symmetric with respect to the antidiagonal. Therefore, if $(r,\overline{r}) \in \mathsf{j}(A)$, then $(r,\overline{r}) \in \mathsf{j}(A^\times)$ as well.

For a LBS or a LHS, it turns out that, for any operator $A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, the sets $\mathsf{d}(A)$ and $\mathsf{i}(A)$ are both sublattices of J. This implies that the domain $\mathcal{D}(A)$ of A is a vector subspace of V. In addition, according to [5, Lemma 3.3.29], if (q,p) and (t,s) belong to $\mathsf{j}(A)$, so do $(q \wedge t, p \wedge s)$ and $(q \vee t, p \vee s)$. Actually, this property remains true if V_J is a *projective* indexed PIP-space, that is, for each pair p, q, the Mackey topology on $V_{p\wedge q} = V_p \cap V_q$ coincides with the projective topology inherited from V_p and V_q. Thus Proposition 2.3 still holds true in that more general case.

Moreover, $\mathrm{Op}(V_J)$ is a (non associative) partial *-algebra, with respect to the partial multiplication of operators [4]. For studying the lattice properties of $\mathrm{Op}(V_J)$, it is useful to consider the sets

$$\mathcal{O}_{pq} = \{A \in \mathrm{Op}(V_J) : A_{pq} \text{ exists}\}. \tag{A.8}$$

Thus

$$A \in \mathcal{O}_{pq} \iff (q,p) \in \mathsf{j}(A).$$

As compared with the notations of [12], $A \in \mathcal{O}_{pq}$ is the equivalent to $A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F})$, with the interspaces $\mathcal{E} = V_q, \mathcal{F} = V_p$.

Particularly useful are the *dyadic operators*, that is, rank 1 operators of the form $|f\rangle\langle g|$, $f, g \in V$, defined as

$$|f\rangle\langle g|\,(h) = \langle g|h\rangle f \quad h \in V^\#.$$

Since our inner product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$ is linear in the *second* factor, we have $|f\rangle\langle g| := f \otimes \overline{g}$.

Of course, this operator may be extended to any V_r such that $g \in V_{\overline{r}}$. The adjoint of $|f\rangle\langle g|$ is $|g\rangle\langle f|$. One constructs in the same way operators between different spaces and finite linear combinations of dyadics.

References

[1] N.I. Akhiezer and I.M. Glazman, *Theory of Linear Operators in Hilbert space, II*, Dover Publ., New York, 1993.

[2] S. T. Ali, J-P. Antoine, and J-P. Gazeau, *Square integrability of group representations on homogeneous spaces I. Reproducing triples and frames*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré **55** (1991) 829–856.

[3] J-P. Antoine, *Dirac formalism and symmetry problems in Quantum Mechanics. I: General Dirac formalism*, J. Math. Phys.**10** (1969) 53-69.

[4] J-P. Antoine, A. Inoue, and C. Trapani, *Partial *-Algebras and Their Operator Realizations*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2002.

[5] J-P. Antoine and C. Trapani, *Partial Inner Product Spaces: Theory and Applications*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1986, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.

[6] J-P. Antoine and C. Trapani *The partial inner product space method: A quick overview*, Adv. in Math. Phys., Vol. **2010** (2010) 457635 ; *Erratum*, Ibid. Vol. **2011** (2010) 272703.

[7] J-P. Antoine and P. Balazs, *Frames and semi-frames*, J. of Physics A: Math. Theor. **44** (2011) 205201; *Corrigendum*, Ibid. **44**, (2011) 479501.

[8] J-P. Antoine and P. Balazs, *Frames, semi-frames, and Hilbert scales*, Numer. Funct. Anal. Optimiz. **33** (2012)736–769.

[9] D. Babbitt, *Rigged Hilbert spaces and one-particle Schrödinger operators*, Rep. Math. Phys. **3**(1972) 37–42 .

[10] P. Balazs, *Basic definition and properties of Bessel multipliers*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **325** (2007) 571-585 .

[11] P. Balazs, D. Bayer, and A. Rahimi, *Multipliers for continuous frames in Hilbert spaces*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **45** (2012) 244023.

[12] G. Bellomonte, S. Di Bella and C. Trapani, *Operators in rigged Hilbert spaces: Some spectral properties*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **411** (2014) 931-946 .

[13] G. Bellomonte and C. Trapani, *Generalized Riesz bases in Rigged Hilbert spaces,* preprint (2014).

[14] Yu.M. Berezanskii, *Expansions in Eigenfunctions of Self-Adjoint Operators*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1968.

[15] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, *Interpolation Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976.

[16] G. Birkhoff, *Lattice Theory*, 3rd ed. , Amer. Math. Soc., Coll. Publ., Providence, RI., 1966.

[17] I.M. Gel'fand and G.E. Shilov, *Generalized Functions*, Volume **3**, Academic Press, New York, 1961.

[18] I.M. Gel'fand and N.Ya. Vilenkin, *Generalized Functions*, Volume **4**, Academic Press, New York, 1964.

[19] A. Grossmann, R. Hoegh-Krohn, and M. Mebkhout, *A class of explicitly soluble, local, many center, Hamiltonians for one-particle Quantum Mechanics in two and three dimensions. I*, J. Math. Phys. **21** (1980) 2376–2385.

[20] G. Köthe, *Topological Vector Spaces, Vols. I, II*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1969, 1979.

[21] F. Riesz and B. Sz-Nagy, *Functional Analysis*, Frederick Ungar, New York, 1960.

[22] J.E. Roberts, *The Dirac Bra and Ket formalism*, J. Math. Phys. **7** (1966) 1097-1104; J.E. Roberts, *Rigged Hilbert spaces in quantum mechanics*, Commun. Math. Phys. **3** (1966) 98-119.

[23] K. Schmüdgen, *Unbounded self-adjoint operators on Hilbert space*, Springer-Verlag, Dordrecht/Heidelberg, 2012.

[24] J. Weidmann, *Linear Operators in Hilbert Spaces*, Springer, New York, 1980.

Jean-Pierre Antoine
Institut de Recherche en Mathématique et Physique
Université Catholique de Louvain
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve
Belgium
e-mail: jean-pierre.antoine@uclouvain.be

Camillo Trapani
Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica
Università di Palermo
I-90123 Palermo
Italy
e-mail: camillo.trapani@unipa.it